HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME LI OCTOBER, 1958 NUMBER 4

EZEKIEL'S POETIC INDICTMENT OF THE SHEPHERDS

WILLIAM H. BROWNLEE
DUKE UNIVERSITY, DURHAM, N.C.

THE SHEPHERD CHAPTER of Ezekiel, like the Shepherd Psalm, is one of the most beautiful chapters of the Old Testament. The first ten verses upon first examination appear to be a *post eventum* judgment upon the former shepherds of the nation. The glowing promises of 34:11–16 are a counterpart to this indictment. The Lord pledges that he will inaugurate a new order for his sheep whereby he himself will assume the rôle of the good shepherd and perform the functions neglected by Israel's erstwhile earthly rulers. Verses 17–22 are a supplement promising a firm hand against all recalcitrant elements that may appear in the flock itself. In verses 23–24, we return once more to the shepherd theme, but the Lord is no more the Shepherd, but David. Verses 25–31 comprise the final section wherein the Lord binds himself with a covenant to provide for the general well-being (*shalom*) of his flock.

This chapter has often been viewed as a unity, and from the standpoint of its general contents a hope chapter. The doom threatened in the first ten verses has generally been treated as *literarische Fiktion*,[1] and as backdrop for the main theme of the chapter, the hope for the future. The only exception to this, of which I am aware, is William A. Irwin, who claimed 34:1–2 as a genuine contribution by Ezekiel, with the rest of the material as an accretion. Verse two provided a single tristich line which he took as a complete and independent poem. Concerning it he declares:

> The oracle is seen, then, to be a denunciation of the selfish exploita-

[1] Georg Fohrer, Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel, Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Beihefte 72, 1952, p. 91.

tion of the common people by the rulers of Judah. No date is intimated; it might be regarded as a *post eventum* judgment on the fall of the state. But Ezekiel does not show himself interested in that sort of utterance; his concern is with vital issues and conduct of the moment. The selfish rulers were much more probably a contemporary reality when he spoke these words. . . . Contrary to general opinion, this is not an oracle of comfort and encouragement but the reverse. It is due to the spurious additions that the chapter has been so classed.[2]

In 1944, when I began my research on the Book of Ezekiel under Dr. William F. Stinespring, I was skeptical of radical critical theories of Ezekiel and vowed that I would make an objective study of the book itself before allowing myself to be influenced by any critical scholars. Hence I regarded as my first duty the reading of the entire book through in Hebrew in order to gain first hand impressions uncolored by what anyone else may have written. In laboriously conducting this study, looking up words where necessary, proceeding a verse at a time, I read the following words of 6*a*:

> My flock are gone astray on all the mountains,
> And upon every high hill.

Having seen the "mountains" and the "high hills" before in cultic contexts, instinctively without reading further, I penciled into the margin of my Hebrew Bible, "high places." Though immediately afterward I read 6*b* which contradicted this interpretation, I allowed my marginal comment to remain unerased. Still, I concluded that the straying upon the hills was but poetic figure for an extensive dispersion.

Afterward, in turning to the higher criticism of the book, I found a disposition on the part of various scholars to question the genuineness of this chapter in view of the extensive dispersion implied there. Among those rejecting the genuineness are G. Hölscher and George Ricker Berry. W. A. Irwin rejected nearly all the chapter as genuine. I. G. Matthews expressed himself cautiously:

> There are no infallible landmarks of authorship, but it reads more

[2] The Problem of Ezekiel, University of Chicago Press, 1943, pp. 139 f.

like a disciple of Ezekiel than the master, and suits the historical features of 522 better than earlier.[3]

While contemplating this problem in the summer of 1945, I took up my Hebrew Bible to examine the passage with greater care, and there saw at verse 6 my penciled comment, "high places." Immediately it occurred to me what might have happened, so I examined the passage to see if it were possible to separate out from the first ten verses an oracle of doom unrelated to the situation of the Diaspora. To my own surprise this approach at once yielded an impressive series of tristich lines forming an oracle of doom belonging to the situation before 587 B.C.[4]

Verse 2, with the omission of but one word, yielded two tristich lines of 3/3/3 rhythm:

Son of man —
Prophesy against the shepherds of Israel,
Prophesy and say unto them (to the shepherds)
The LORD [5] hath spoken thus:

Woe to the shepherds of Israel
Who (used to) tend to themselves alone!
Should the shepherds not tend the flock?

"To the shepherds" (לרעים) is an obvious gloss or doublet to "unto them" (אליהם) and is therefore deleted by many critics.[6] In view of the elasticity of Hebrew rhythm, the word היו could possibly be allowed to remain in verse 2*b*, by combining it accentually with either the preceding or following word; but its effect

[3] An American Commentary on the Old Testament, American Baptist Publication Society, 1939.

[4] See my Th. M. thesis, Major Critical Problems in the Book of Ezekiel, Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, 1946, pp. 106–110; also my Ph.D. thesis, The Book of Ezekiel — the Original Prophet and the Editors, Duke University, 1947, pp. 297–318.

[5] As almost a universal rule in the Hebrew Old Testament, the combination אדני יהוה is not original, the former word being introduced as a gloss and surrogate for the latter. Later, the Masoretes, who failed to understand this, vocalized both words; but in order to avoid repetitiousness they had to depart from their usual practice of supplying the vowels for *adonai* for the Tetragrammaton and employ in these cases those of *elohim*. In the present verse some Greek MSS fail to attest אדני.

[6] LXX^{A} which reads αὐτοις would support the omission of לרעים. However LXX^{B} and the Vulgate might be cited in favor of the reading of לרעים without אליהם.

before the participle is to place the whole passage in retrospect, "who *used to tend.*" Since this conflicts with the Hebrew imperfects of the following verse (employed to describe the present situation), this word should also be deleted.

Verse 3 is evidently poetic:

Their milk ye drink,[7]
Their wool ye wear
(*The fatling ye butcher,*)
The flock ye tend not!

This verse is most naturally scanned as 2/2; for normally one will not give the particle את a separate beat. Still one might scan it as 3/3 except for one clause ("The fatling ye butcher") which lacks this particle, which would then require deletion.[8] This clause is further suspect as an interpolation since it interrupts the prevailing tristich pattern; but perhaps we should allow one exception to the rule and retain verse 3 fully.

From verse 4 nothing need be omitted, except ו אותם from the last clause: [9]

The diseased ye have not strengthened,
The sick ye have not healed,
The broken ye have not bound!

The banished ye have not restored,
The lost ye have not sought,
The strong ye ruled (them and) harshly.

The omission of "them and" is not simply *metri causa*, since the LXX omits the words. The scansion adopted here is 3/3/3. It might also be scanned as 2/2/2 by denying the negative particle

[7] In the MT, "Their fat ye eat"; but the LXX's vocalization of חלב as "milk" seems more probable. Both sheep and goats as members of the "flock' are still milked in Palestine. From the sheep milk is made a mild and delicious white cheese either firm so as to require slicing or soft so that it can be spread.

[8] In that case one should translate in harmony with this scansion:

Their milk ye drink indeed,
Their wool ye wear indeed,
The flock ye do not tend!

A common characteristic of the third member of a tristich line is to sum up the first two, rather than introduce a new parallelistic term.

[9] But one must vocalize *uvaḥᵃzāqāh* for MT *uvᶜḥozqāh*, after the Greek.

a separate beat, if it were not that the last clause requires three beats.[10]

In verses 5 and 6 there is heavy glossing. Only three clauses emerge as plausibly poetic. They form a single tristich line of 3/3/3 rhythm:

5 For lack of a shepherd they are scattered!
(They have become food for all the wild beasts and
are scattered.)

6 My flock are gone astray on all hills
And upon every lofty height!
(My flock are scattered all over the face of the earth,
no one seeks, no one searches for them.)

In both 5*b* and in 6*b* the doom of the nation is regarded as past. In 5*b* the Chaldaeans are represented by the "wild beasts" who have already devoured and scattered the flock. In 6*b* this dispersion is portrayed as world-wide. The prosaic character of these comments proves that they are glosses.

In verses 7 and 9 we have nearly identical transitions to the pronouncement of doom:

7 Therefore, O shepherds!
Hear the word of the LORD.

9 Therefore, O shepherds!
Hear the LORD's word.

A close comparison favors the wording of verse 9 as original. In

[10] If one adopts the 2/2/2 scansion, for the sake of regularity, he could omit the last word of verse 4, and translate:

The diseased ye strengthened not,
The sick ye healed not,
The broken ye bound not!
The banished ye restored not,
The lost ye sought not,
The strong ye oppressed!

That in any case the verse is to be read as tristichs rather than distichs is to be seen by the fact that the parallelism lies between the second and third and between the fourth and fifth clauses rather than between the third and fourth stichs as required by the distich division. An interesting commentary on this verse in reverse is verse 16, which beginning with the next to the last clause of verse 4 proceeds in reverse order in building up the antitheses. It moves back into verse 3 singling out the one item suspected as an interpolation (perhaps by this editor) and then concludes with an antithesis to the final clause of verse 4.

the first stich the vocative is best expressed with the article as in verse 9; and the omission of the sign of the accusative in the second clause in verse 9 makes it possible to link דבר with its genitive יהוה in order to limit the stich to two beats.[11] With this introduction, the first stich of verse 10 ("Thus saith the LORD") may be read in order to obtain a regular tristich line.[12]

Only the second half of verse 8 is poetic, the first half being prose material, which together with the interpolation of verse 7, was intended to give an oratorical recapitulation preparatory to the pronouncement of doom:

> As I live! is the oracle of the Lord, surely, in as much as my flock became prey and my flock served as food for all the wild beasts in the absence of a shepherd,
>
> And my shepherds have not sought for my flock,
> But the shepherds have tended to themselves,
> While neglecting to tend to my flock!

Verse 8*b* joins well with 6*a* and brings the poem to a resounding climax, by reiterating the main charge of the genuine poem, that the shepherds have neglected the flock, while selfishly tending to their own interests. This is sufficient "build-up" without 8*a*, which is not only prosaic, but also introduces the spurious theme of the "wild beasts" from verse 5*b*.

We are now prepared for divine judgment which immediately follows the transitional introduction:

9 Therefore, O shepherds!
Hear the LORD's word,
10 Thus saith the LORD:

Behold [I'm] opposed to the shepherds;
My flock I'll require at their hand!
I'll remove them from 'tending' my flock! [13]

The shepherds shall not tend to themselves (any more),
But I'll save my flock from their mouths!
No more shall it serve them for food!

[11] Cf. the placement of the *maqqeph* by the MT. Twenty MSS of Kennicott omit the sign of the accusative in verse 7 also.

[12] There is Greek testimony for the omission of אדני. Cf. also note 5 above. The introductory clause כה אמר יהוה is adjustable to metrical context as either a two-beat or a three-beat stich.

[13] Restoring "my" (צאני) with Greek and Syriac.

These lines are practically intact, except that at one point a word seems to have fallen out, and at another point there seems to be an added word. In verse 10*a*, הנני אל־הרעים seems too short; for it is doubtful procedure to assign a full beat to אל (or על). Occasionally in Ezekiel, הנני is followed by אני.[14] The omission of the latter through haplography is readily explicable. In fact the beginning of verse 11 seems to be a fragmentary doublet to 10*a* and preserves the lost word: "Behold, *I'M* — and my flock I'll require." Therefore we interpolate this word into 10*a*. At verse 10*b*, the adverb עוד ("any more") seems superfluous and makes the stich in which it stands too heavy. Hence *metri causa* it should be deleted. All the verbs of verse 10 are either imperfect, or the equivalent *waw*-consecutive perfect tense, which should indicate the future character of the doom.

The result of this examination of 34:1–10 is the recovery of a poem of nine or ten tristich lines, all but one of which are transparently visible, since heavy glossing occurs only in verses 5–8*a*. Verse 3 must be treated either as consisting of two distichs from which nothing is to be omitted, or as one tristich after the deletion of a supposedly added clause. The poetic criteria alone are sufficient for rejecting materials which treat the fall of the nation in retrospect. Internal evidence points to a date of composition prior to 587 B.C. W. A. Irwin was on the right track in his approach to this chapter, but was satisfied too quickly in concluding his research with but one tristich line, verse 2*b*![15]

Beyond 34:10, much of the hope material is also poetic, some of it employing the tristich pattern. Verses 11–13 may be criticized as follows:

11 For thus hath said the Lord:

("Behold, I'm —
And my flock I'll require," and seek them.)[16]

[14] Cf. 6:3 and 34:20. Literally this should be rendered, "Behold me, I myself"; but this overburdens the meter in English.

[15] The author deeply appreciates the kind words of W. A. Irwin in his article "Ezekiel Research since 1943," Vetus Testamentum, Vol. III, No. 1, 1953, pp. 54–66, in which he states (p. 66): ". . . his findings constitute the one serious threat as yet presented to my analysis."

[16] This interpolated material (reproducing in part the language of verse 10) is to be rejected on rhythmic grounds. Though the Hebrew is awkward, it might

12 As the shepherd seeks his flock
On the day he is among his sheep [17] (which are scattered),
So will I seek my flock!

I will deliver them from all places
whither they were scattered abroad
On the day of cloud and of deep gloom!

13 I'll bring them from the peoples,
I'll gather them from the lands,
I'll lead them to their country!

I'll feed them upon the mountains of Israel,
And in all of the settlements of the Land.

Space will not permit us to pursue the text further; but this happy, rhapsodic passage is doubtless separated by both time and outlook from the doom material which precedes it. One might consider assigning this supplement to Ezekiel himself at a later date, if it were not that the scattering of the flock is applied to the Diaspora rather than to straying at the high places, to which the genuine material of verse 6*a* originally referred. Since Ezekiel is not likely to have altered the interpretation of his own poem, we must regard the author of the hope poetry as another man of a later date. A time after 522 B.C. seems likely.

Ezekiel 34 requires examination also in relation to its literary associations with the prophet Jeremiah. Careful study justifies the following conclusions:

(1) There is nothing to show a dependence of the genuine Ezekiel upon Jeremiah 23:1–2, the doom portion of Jeremiah's similar oracle. The shepherd motif, which is a common one in ancient literature, proves nothing as to literary dependence, since in Jeremiah the theme is developed quite differently from the genuine Ezekiel. There is nothing to show that the scattering in Jeremiah involves straying at the high places. The reference, however, to the driving away of the sheep has a point of contact with the "banished" of Ezekiel 34:4 where the same Hebrew root is involved (נדח). This suggests that there were fugitives

be translated: "Behold me! It is I myself; and I will require my flock and seek them."

[17] Or better, "flock" consisting of both sheep and goats; but the Hebrew has two words for flock here, whereas English has no synonym but the inaccurate "sheep."

from the rule of Zedekiah, and that this is the scattering of which Jeremiah spoke, and the banishment to which Ezekiel alludes.

(2) The view that Ezekiel 34:6*a* refers to worship at the high places is supported by Jeremiah 50:6–7 (as rightly interpreted by Elmer A. Leslie): [18]

6 An erring flock have my people been;
Their shepherds have let them wander about upon the mountains,
They have enticed them away from *the mountain*:
They have resorted to the hills;
They have forgotten *their resting-place.*
7 All who have led them have devoured them,
And their enemies say, "We do not count ourselves guilty."
Rather they have sinned against the Lord,
In whom dwells righteousness, the hope of their fathers.

Leslie rightly interprets the "mountains" and the "hills" as the "high hills of illicit cults," and "*the mountain*" and "*their resting-place*" as referring to the temple mount, the place of true worship. Although the meaning of the straying is here precisely as in Ezekiel 34:5–6, the standpoint of Jeremiah is a bit later; for verse 7 indicates that the enemy has already devoured these straying sheep. The prophet Ezekiel was certainly not dependent upon this passage since for him the doom of Judah is future.

(3) The reference to the Diaspora in the hope supplement of Jeremiah 23:3–4, of course, has an exact parallel in the gloss of Ezekiel 34:6*b* and in the poetry of 34:12 ff. There could be a dependence here between the hope editors. They may even have collaborated.

(4) There may be some literary dependence upon Jeremiah by the prose glossator of Ezekiel 34:5, 8, in regard to the theme of "wild beasts." Not only may one compare the devouring enemies of Jeremiah 50:7, but more strikingly 50:17:

> Israel is a hunted sheep, driven away by lions. First the king of Assyria devoured him, and now at last Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon has gnawed his bones. (RSV)

[18] Jeremiah, Chronologically arranged, translated, and interpreted, Abingdon Press, 1954, pp. 296 f. The following translation is that of Leslie, with the italics my own. Independent of Leslie, I had already reached this interpretation of Jeremiah.

The reversal of this theme occurs also in the late additions of Ezekiel 34:25, 28.

(5) The hope of David as a shepherd in Ezekiel 34:23 represents the later level of Messianic expectation found in Jeremiah 23:5–6, rather than the more general hope of better shepherds in the future found in Jeremiah 23:4.

The conclusion to this literary examination is that the genuine contribution of Ezekiel 34 is independent of Jeremiah, whereas the hope materials seem to be later than similar materials in Jeremiah, and possibly dependent upon them. At best these hope elements of Ezekiel 34 seem to be contemporary with the latest elements in the book of Jeremiah. To insist upon the unity of Ezekiel 34, therefore, is to undermine the authenticity of the chapter as a whole,[19] whereas the critical approach undertaken here recovers for him a strong ethical indictment of exquisite beauty and power.

If my analysis of the shepherd chapter of Ezekiel is correct, we have here several conclusions with important implications for the whole book:

(1) Ezekiel was a poet, who often wrote in the tristich pattern, as Irwin has correctly observed.[20]

(2) Ezekiel's poetry is sometimes heavily glossed as in verses 5–8, so that not only is the original poetry obscured, but its original meaning is altered.[21]

(3) The poetry is much more extensive than Irwin had supposed, so that much more conservative results are achieved. I have restored a similar greater proportion of poetry elsewhere in Ezekiel than Irwin. Perhaps, therefore, my work will appear less drastic and more convincing than his.[22]

(4) The genuine Ezekiel emerges as a poet of doom. The hope

[19] Cf. Herbert G. May in Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 6, p. 251: "The closest analogies of the passage are postexilic in date. . . . The diction and ideology, with the picture of the Davidic Messiah and the doctrine of the new covenant, point to the editor as most probable author."

[20] The present poem is exceptional in that it consists entirely of tristichs. Ezekiel frequently varies his strophic and metrical pattern within a single poem.

[21] For a poem with heavy glossing, see Brownlee, "Exorcising the Souls from Ezekiel 13:17–23," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXIX, Part IV, 1950, pp. 367–373.

[22] It is not the conservative character of conclusions which proves them correct, however, but the validity of the analysis and the correctness of the interpretations.

of the ingathering of the Diaspora (found so often in Ezekiel) is shown by the present chapter to be non-genuine; for it misinterprets Ezekiel's original oracle.[23]

(5) This has important bearing upon the disputed locale of Ezekiel, for the only material of Ezekiel of any relevance to the Exiles would be hope passages like Ezekiel 34:12 ff. — even though the Exile is not explicitly mentioned in such passages, but rather a general dispersion.[24]

(6) Ezekiel emerges as an upholder of the Deuteronomic reform, as seen in his indictment of the rulers of his day for failure to enforce this reform, by allowing the sheep to wander off from the temple to the idolatrous hill tops.[25]

As an appendix we attach the Hebrew of the restored poem of Ezekiel.

RESTORED HEBREW TEXT OF EZEKIEL 34:1–10

1 ויהי דבר־יהוה אלי לאמר:
2 בן־אדם
הנבא על־רעי ישראל הנבא ואמרת אליהם
כה אמר יהוה:
הוי רעי ישראל אשר רעים אותם
הלוא־הצאן ירעו הרעים:

3 את־החלב תאכלו ואת־הצמר תלבשו
(הבריאה .תזבחו) הצאן לא־תרעו:
4 את־הנחלות לא חזקתם ואת־החולה לא רפאתם
ולנשברת לא חבשתם:
ואת־הנדחת לא חשבתם ואת־האבדת לא בקשתם
ובחזקה רדיתם בפרך:

[23] The pre-exilic prophets afford many examples of poetic oracles of doom being later supplemented by poetic oracles of hope. The fact that the poetry continues throughout the chapter, with various degrees of glossing, does not prove the unity of the chapter. A similar situation of hope supplements to doom material exists elsewhere in the Book of Ezekiel.

[24] One searches in vain for anything in Ezekiel as directly relevant to the Exiles as Jeremiah 29. This is most strange if Ezekiel was all the while in the Exile. Only an editorial framework places Ezekiel in the Exile. All his oracles are addressed to Judaeans and Jerusalemites in the home country, to whom he was appointed as a watchman to warn them of approaching doom.

[25] Whereas we interpret the "shepherds" as civil rulers, perhaps this is a cultic term inclusive of false prophets as well. Cf. Isaiah 56:11.

5–6	ותפוצינה מבלי רעה	ישגו צאני בכל־ההרים ועל כל־גבעה רמה: וירעו הרעים אותם ואת־צאני לא רעו:
8	ולא־דרשו רעי את־צאני	
9	לכן הרעים	שמעו דבר־יהוה כה־אמר יהוה:
10	הנני [אני] על הרעים	ודרשתי את־צאני מידם וחשבתים מרעות צאני: והצלתי צאני מפיהם ולא־תהיין להם לאכלה
	ולא־ירעו הרעים אותם	

TRANSLATION OF THE RESTORED TEXT OF EZEKIEL 34:1–10[26]

1 And the word of the Lord came to me, saying: [27]

2 Son of man — [28]

Prophesy against the shepherds of Israel;
Prophesy and say unto them,
The Lord hath spoken thus:

Woe to the shepherds of Israel,
Who tend to themselves alone!
Should the shepherds not tend the flock?

3 Their milk ye drink indeed,
Their wool ye wear indeed,
The flock ye do not tend!

Or

Their milk ye drink,
Their wool ye wear,
(The fatling ye butcher,)
The flock ye tend not!

[26] The translation distinguishes three-beat rhythm from two-beat by indenting the latter further to the right.

[27] This is a common editorial introduction, perhaps from Ezekiel.

[28] The vocative "Son of man" is here treated as an anacrusis. Metrical context determines whether it stands within or without the rhythmical lines.

4 The diseased ye have not strengthened,
The sick ye have not healed,
The broken ye have not bound!

The banished ye have not restored,
The lost ye have not sought,
The strong ye ruled with harshness!

5 For lack of a shepherd they are scattered!
6 My flock are gone astray on all hills
And upon every lofty height!

8 My shepherds have not sought for my flock,
But the shepherds have tended to themselves,
While neglecting to tend to my flock!

9 (7) Therefore, O shepherds!
Hear the Lord's word;
10 Thus saith the Lord:

Behold, I'm opposed to the shepherds;
My flock I'll require at their hand!
I'll remove them from 'tending' my flock!

The shepherds shall not tend to themselves,
But I'll save my flock from their mouths!
No more shall it serve them for food!

THE OLD TESTAMENT OF THE EARLY CHURCH
(A Study in Canon)

ALBERT C. SUNDBERG, JR.*
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY, DALLAS, TEXAS

FOR THREE-QUARTERS of a century the hypothesis of an Alexandrian canon has been the commonly accepted solution to the problem of how the Jewish canon and the Old Testament of the early church came to differ. That hypothesis suggests that a larger canon of scriptures was initiated in Alexandria and circulated throughout Diaspora Judaism than what obtained in Palestine. The Christian church, becoming predominantly Gentile early in its history, adopted this enlarged canon, that included the books of the Apocrypha, from Diaspora Judaism.[1] The hypothesis represents essentially a geographic distinction in canonical usage between Palestinian Judaism and Alexandrian and Dispersion Judaism. It is the opinion of the present writer that the Alexandrian canon hypothesis is not only unprovable, as Pfeiffer has recognized,[2] but is erroneous. This opinion is based (1) on a study of the history of the Alexandrian canon hypothesis, (2) on an examination of the arguments favoring the hypothesis, and (3) on a re-evaluation of the status of canonical usage in Judaism at the time of the emergence of Christianity into the world.

A study of the history of the Alexandrian canon hypothesis shows that the hypothesis arose in Protestantism about the end of the seventeenth century and seems to have been first postulated by an Anglican divine, John Grabe (1666–1711), who suggested that a Sanhedrin in Alexandria, similar to the Great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem, had canonized the books of the Apocrypha.[3] About half a century later John Semler (1725–1791), a professor of theology at Halle, independently, and believing himself to be the first to do so, offered an Alexandrian canon hypothesis that out-

* This paper is a summary of a thesis with the same title presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University.

[1] R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York, 1941), pp. 65–69.

[2] Ibid., p. 67.

[3] Prolegomena to the Septuagint, cited by W. R. Churton, The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures (London, 1884), p. 12.

lined essentially the hypothesis as it has been passed down to the present.[4] Similar to Grabe, Semler recognized that the New Testament clearly indicates that a larger collection of religious writings was used by the early Christians than that of the Hebrew canon. And having no reason to doubt the tradition, passed down through Elias Levita from Rabbinic tradition,[5] that the Hebrew canon had been closed by Ezra and the Men of the Great Synagogue, Semler was forced to look outside Palestine for a larger canon that corresponded to Christian usage. Semler, further, believed that the books of the Apocrypha showed themselves, by internal evidence, to have been composed in Greek. It must have been, he concluded, in Greek-speaking Judaism of the Diaspora that these books came into existence. The traditional story of the translation of the Hebrew books into Greek at Alexandria provided the focus of a place where an enlarged Greek canon must have been instituted.[6]

The postulating of such an Alexandrian canon hypothesis represented a break with what had been a Protestant dogma, that the Jewish canon had been closed at the time of Ezra and was the same throughout Judaism. That dogma maintained that the New Testament showed no evidence of the use of any other books than the Hebrew canon. The adoption of the Apocrypha as canonical, the Protestants argued, was a recent innovation of the Catholic Church; the Apocrypha had never been considered canonical before the Council of Trent.[7] The problem of the contents of the Old Testament in the church had come to the fore in Luther's debate with Eck (1519) in which Luther, arguing against the doctrine of purgatory, denied that II Maccabees, which provided a favorite purgatory proof-text (xii.45), was canonical; Jerome had not included it in the canon.[8] The discussion crystal-

[4] J. S. Semler, Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon, I (Halle, 1771), 9–128.

[5] The Massoreth ha-Massoreth, ed. and trans. C. D. Ginsburg (London, 1867), pp. 119–120. Semler, op. cit., p. 103.

[6] Ibid., pp. 121–122.

[7] J. Cosin, A Scholastical History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture (London, 1657), cited from The Works of the Right Reverened Father in God John Cosin, now first collected, ed. J. Sansom (Oxford, 1849), pp. 23, 35–40; 263, 5, 14; 8–12, 264–268, etc.

[8] J. K. F. Knaake, et. al., eds., D. Martin Luthers Werke (Weimar, 1883–1939),

lized into Protestant-Catholic controversy when the Catholic Church reaffirmed the late fourth and early fifth century conciliar decisions in the West [9] at the Council of Trent by declaring that the books of the Apocrypha were canonical and pronounced an anathema upon all who denied it.[10]

The Alexandrian canon hypothesis passed through varying forms with regard to details in the hands of liberal Protestant scholars. But it did not come to be generally received until the last quarter of the nineteenth century when Kuenen, by tracing its history, was able to show the dubious character of the tradition of the closing of the canon by Ezra and the Great Synagogue.[11] Until Kuenen the tradition of the closing of the canon by Ezra had served as the Protestant bulwark against all argument and evidence for a larger scriptural usage in the early church. But with Kuenen that bulwark was breached and the Alexandrian canon hypothesis came to be generally received.

It is important to notice, however, that during this period and subsequently, no new evidence has been forthcoming to buttress the Alexandrian canon hypothesis. Moreover, without their implications being brought to bear on the hypothesis, scholarly findings have been moving in quite the opposite direction. Rabbinic studies have revised downward the date of the canonization of the Hebrew scriptures until it has come to rest about the end of the first century A.D.[12] Linguistic analysis of the extra-canonical Jewish literature has shown that the great bulk of it was written in Hebrew and Aramaic. Of the Apocrypha, Pfeiffer considers only Wisdom of Solomon, II Maccabees, and portions of Esther

---

II, 328 ff. H. H. Howorth, "The Bible Canon of the Reformation," The International Journal of Apocrypha, XV (1908), 10–11; XX (1910), 13–15.

[9] Rome, 382 A.D. (A critical edition of the oldest manuscript of this council was published by C. H. Turner, "Latin Lists of the Canonical Books," JTS, I (1900), 554–560.) At Hippo, 393 A.D., Sacrorum conciliorum; nova et amplissima collectio, ed. G. D. Mansi (Florentiae, 1759–1792), III, 850. At Carthage, 397 and 419 A.D., Ibid., p. 891 and IV, 430, respectively.

[10] C. W. E. Reuss, History of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Church, second ed., trans. D. Hunter (Edinburgh, 1891), pp. 276–279. Churton, op. cit., p. 17.

[11] A. Kuenen, "Uber die Männer der grossen Synagogue," trans., K. Budde, Gesammelt Abhandlungen zur biblischen Wissenschaft von Dr. Abraham Kuenen (Freiburg i.B., 1894), pp. 125–160.

[12] Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 64. O. Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Tübingen, 1934), pp. 622–625. G. F. Moore, Judaism (Cambridge, 1927–1930), I, 240–242.

(xiii.1–7, and xvi.1–24) as composed in Greek; of the Pseudepigrapha, he lists only the Letter of Aristeas, the Sibyllines, III and IV Maccabees, Slavonic Enoch, and Greek Baruch as of Greek origin.[13] And in this Pfeiffer and Torrey are in substantial agreement.[14] Textual finds increasingly support these conclusions. Thus the foundations upon which Grabe and Semler had postulated their hypothesis have been swept away while their hypothesis remains.

The arguments that Pfeiffer advances as favoring the Alexandrian canon hypothesis may be considered representative.[15] These arguments, Pfeiffer recognizes, do not constitute proof of the hypothesis.[16] But, while recognizing their inability to establish the hypothesis, their validity still needs to be examined: (1) In support of the Alexandrian canon hypothesis Pfeiffer suggests that all profane literature was in Greek in Alexandria. And since the Law, the Prophets, and other sacred books had been translated from Hebrew in Alexandria, it was natural to consider all writings translated from Hebrew or Aramaic as sacred.[17] But this does not account for the inclusion of the Wisdom of Solomon and II Maccabees, works composed in Greek, among the Apocrypha. Likewise, the books of the Pseudepigrapha that were composed in Hebrew and Aramaic and subsequently translated into Greek are not considered in this explanation. (2) Pfeiffer points out that Philo knows no theory of the limitation of inspiration to ancient days before Ezra.[18] But, on the one hand, need Philo have mentioned such a theory if he knew it? And, on the other hand, since there is no evidence in Palestine for such a theory before Josephus,[19] and since this theory may have arisen only after 70 A.D., its absence in Philo is irrelevant. (3) Pfeiffer's contention that the position of the Law was so elevated in Alexandria that the demarcation between Prophets and Writings was not generally recognized [20] appears highly improbable. The unique authority of the Law was recognized

[13] R. H. Pfeiffer, "Introduction to the Apocrypha," The Apocrypha (New York, 1953), pp. xii–xv. Idem, History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York, 1949), pp. 60–61, and loc. cit.

[14] C. C. Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature (New Haven, 1945), pp. 3, 7, 9, 11, and loc. cit.

[15] Int. to O. T., pp. 65–69. [16] Ibid., p. 67. [17] Ibm.
[18] Ibm. [19] Ibid., p. 63. [20] Ibid., p. 67.

throughout Judaism.[21] Moreover, the tripartite division of the scriptures in Egypt is not witnessed to solely by the prologue to Ecclesiasticus as Pfeiffer implies.[22] Philo, in the Contemplative Life (iii), suggests a division of the scriptures into Law, Prophets, and Psalms and the others (*νόμους καὶ λόγια θεσπισθέντα διὰ προφητῶν καὶ ὕμνους καὶ τὰ ἄλλα*), similar to the divisions of Ecclesiasticus with no definite designation for the third category. In this passage Philo is describing the practice of the Therapeutae (and he seems to distinguish between the scriptures and the narrowly sectarian writings of the group, iii) and Wolfson goes so far as to consider this passage indicative of Philo's own tripartite division of the scriptures.[23] Moreover, II Maccabees (xv.9), similar to the practice in the Gospels, divides the scriptures into the Law and the Prophets (*ἐκ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν*).[24]

Pfeiffer cites Josephus' numeration of the canon (Against Apion I.viii) as evidence for the lack of distinction between Prophets and Writings. But it must be asked if Josephus, who, to be sure, visited Alexandria, but whose home was Palestine until the war (70 A.D.), and later Rome, is to be preferred as evidence for Alexandrian practice above the prologue of Ecclesiasticus, II Maccabees, and Philo who witness to the Law and the Prophets as recognized collections in Egypt. Rather, it may be that Josephus represents a special case in this matter. Even he seems to have a, though highly irregular, tripartite division of the Old Testament (Against Apion I.viii).[25] Josephus is especially

[21] W. R. Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church (New York, 1890), pp. 145–146. Moore, op. cit., I, 239, 245.

[22] Ibm.

[23] H. Wolfson, Philo (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), I, 117.

[24] Cf. S. Zeitlin, ed., The Second Book of Maccabees (New York, 1954), pp. 240–241.

[25] F. Buhl, Canon and Text of the Old Testament, trans. J. MacPherson (Edinburgh, 1892), p. 18; H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge, 1900), p. 217; H. E. Ryle, The Canon of the Old Testament (London, 1914), pp. 165 ff.; H. J. Thackeray, Josephus, the Man and the Historian (New York, 1929), p. 79, who concludes that Josephus' strange division of the scriptures was not peculiar to him but had support in some Palestinian circles. He bases this upon the fact that Origen and Jerome, who obtained their information from Palestinian traditon also have twenty-two books in the Old Testament. P. Katz, "The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVII (1956), 191–217, follows much the same argument. However, this argument is questionable since the lists of Origen and Jerome are not divisible according to Josephus' arrangement. The number twenty-two,

concerned with the history of his people. In this passage he apparently wishes to treat as many of the Jewish scriptures as possible as histories; even the Law is treated as a history of mankind from the beginning of man to Moses. Having numbered thirteen books among the Prophets, he equates them all to history. Apparently only those books that could not be considered histories were placed in the third category.[26] It seems probable that this arrangement was peculiar to Josephus and was intended to serve his apologetic purposes.

Another argument used to support the contention that the elevation of the Law in Alexandria tended to obliterate the distinction between Prophets and Writings is derived from the preponderance of quotations and allusions from the Law as compared with the Prophets and Writings in Philo's works.[27] But this majority of quotations and allusions from the Law may not be indicative of a canonical practice that differed from Palestine. The introductory formulas that Philo uses for citations from books outside the Law do not reflect a difference of status from those from the Law.[28] Knox believes that Philo's usage embodies older materials reflecting exegetical practice in Alexandria at a time when only the Law had been translated into Greek.[29] Moreover, neither the Letter of Aristeas nor Philo constitute evidence of a preponderance of Law that destroyed the distinction between Prophets and Writings. The Law possessed such a place of unique authority *in Palestine* that Prophets and Writings were subordinated to the place of commentary.[30] This subordination, however, did not destroy the distinction between these collections. The dubious character of these arguments for an Alexandrian canon is evident.

---

being related to the Hebrew alphabet, seems to be mechanical in this respect. Therefore, while the number of books is the same, Josephus' order remains peculiar to him.

[26] Smith, op. cit., pp. 150–151.

[27] Pfeiffer, Int. to O.T., p. 67. W. L. Knox, "A Note on Philo's Use of the Old Testament," JTS, XLI (1940), 30, gives the ratio as 50 from outside the Law to 2,000 from the Law.

[28] Ryle, op. cit., pp. 158–159; Idem, Philo and Holy Scripture (London, 1895), pp. xvii, xxxii–xxxiii; Swete, op. cit., pp. 374–375.

[29] Op. cit., p. 34; Idem, Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity (London, 1944), pp. 34–35.

[30] Smith, op. cit., pp. 145–146; Buhl, op. cit., pp. 8–9; Moore, op. cit., I, 239, 245.

Two other issues relative to the Alexandrian canon hypothesis need to be raised. If the church adopted a canon out of Alexandria, should not one expect to find a consonant testimony to that canon in the Old Testament lists of the church fathers and the early church councils? In Judaism, where a closed canon did exist after Jamnia, that fact is attested by canonical lists identical in content in subsequent Judaism.[31] But the variety evident in Christian lists of the Old Testament has led Jepsen to postulate that the church determined the content of its Old Testament for itself.[32] Moreover, the supposition that Diaspora Judaism followed the canonical practice of Alexandria rather than that of Jerusalem makes of Alexandria a kind of Mecca for Hellenistic Judaism. The proponents of the Alexandrian canon hypothesis have really to show how it was that Diaspora Judaism, from which pilgrims gathered annually to the festivals in Jerusalem,[33] followed Alexandria in the matter of canon while Jerusalem stood, but quickly acquiesced to the decisions of the schools at Jamnia.[34]

It appears, therefore, that the Alexandrian canon hypothesis is now commonly received because its basic presuppositions have

[31] Ryle, Canon, p. 280; Swete, op. cit., p. 200.

[32] A. Jepsen, "Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments," Theologische Literaturzeitung, LXXXIV (1949), 65–74. Cf. Swete, op. cit., pp. 201–214, for a collection of Christian Old Testament lists. A.D. Nock, in his review of Traditio [Am. Jl. of Phil., LXVII (1946), 367], raises the question whether the Christians, in making a greater emphasis on the Prophets and less or qualified emphasis on the Law, tend toward a more uniform valuation of the Old Testament as a whole? When comparing Christian usage with Philo, such would appear to be the case. But when New Testament usage is compared with other areas in Judaism, e.g., rabbinics, Josephus, and the subject matter of the paintings at Dura, the New Testament usage does not seem to differ significantly. The percentages between Law and Prophets-Writings are: rabbinic usage 33/67 [Knox, "Philo's Use of the O.T.," p. 31]; Josephus 29/71 [according to the index in The Works of Flavius Josephus, trans. W. Winston (Philadelphia)]; Dura 32/68, where the prominence of Esther should be noted [The Excavations at Dura-Europas, conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions and Letters, Final Report (New Haven 1956), VIII, 349–350, 151]; New Testament 28/72 [according to the index in Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. E. Nestle (Stuttgart, 1948)]. The citations from Prophets and Writings are about equally divided in the New Testament. It would, therefore, appear that the more uniform evaluation of the Old Testament in Christian hands is to be sought in the mode rather than in the frequency of citation.

[33] Acts ii. 5–13. Swete, op. cit., pp. 7–8. G. Wildeboer, The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament, trans. B. W. Bacon (London, 1895), pp. 19–21, 35. H. M. Orlinsky, The Septuagint (Cincinnati, 1949), p. 1.

[34] So Buhl, op. cit., pp. 45–46. Orlinsky, op. cit., p. 5.

been forgotten. Consequently the revised attitude as to the language and place of origin of the extra-canonical literature and as to the dating of the Hebrew canon have not been directly related to the Alexandrian hypothesis. Since the history of the Alexandrian canon hypothesis is now brought to light, the relation of these developments becomes evident; the Alexandrian canon hypothesis is left virtually without support. It may not, then, be an indiscretion to suggest another hypothesis as to the source of the scriptures of the early church. This writer suggests that the early church adopted the canonical usage that obtained throughout Judaism at the time of the rise of Christianity. The suggestion is based on a re-evaluation of canonical usage in Palestine before Jamnia.

The circulation of the extra-canonical literature in Hellenistic Judaism is assumed in the Alexandrian canon hypothesis and is sufficiently evidenced by the translation of this literature into Greek; it need not be argued. But what was the canonical usage of Palestine before Jamnia? Proponents of the Alexandrian canon hypothesis have assumed a *de facto* canon that was identical, or nearly so, with the canon of Jamnia. And the geographic division between Palestine and Diaspora Judaism has been thought to imply a parallel division between Hebrew (and/or Aramaic) and Greek. Such a division is basic to the Alexandrian canon hypothesis. But the Hellenistic element in Palestinian Judaism is more and more coming to the fore. Lieberman has pointed out the evidence for the use of Greek in Palestine in the Rabbinic materials.[35] Goodenough has been able to provide comparative figures for the prevalence of Greek in Palestine. He tells us that Greek names are nearly as common as Hebrew and Aramaic names combined on first century A.D. Jewish tombs.[36] Of the names of Jews preserved on ossuaries from the period of the Maccabees to 135 A.D., one third are Greek.[37] Greek inscriptions in Palestinian synagogues show, according to Goodenough, that the setting of Hellenized Judaism, as Alexandrian, over against Palestinian

[35] S. Lieberman, Greek in Jewish Palestine (New York, 1942).

[36] E. R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period (New York, 1953), I, 8–13.

[37] Ibid., pp. 111–132.

Judaism is unwarranted.[38] It appears that a considerable portion of the Palestinian Jewish population at the rise of Christianity was bi-lingual: Aramaic (and Hebrew as a learned language) *and Greek.*

Furthermore, it is now evident that the Septuagint circulated in Palestine. This inference was suggested to Semler by the use of the Septuagint in the earliest Christian writings of the New Testament.[39] Now the scant evidence for the existence of the Septuagint in the hands of Jews has been greatly extended by finds at Muraba'at. Among these finds were fragments of six of the Minor Prophets (Micah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Zechariah) in Greek.[40] Barthélemy has shown that the text of these fragments, assigned to the end of the first century A.D., is most probably a recension of the Septuagint and that it stands very close to Justin's quotations from the Old Testament.[41] This indicates that a Greek text type used among Christians of the second century was current among Jews in Palestine in the first century A.D. Moreover, Stendahl has found support for Swete's suggestion that the text of the New Testament quotations from the Old is to be found in a Palestinian Septuagint tradition.[42] Pfeiffer is probably right in saying that the Christians received their Old Testament in Greek before the closing of the Jewish canon at Jamnia.[43] But the implication of Barthélemy and Stendahl is that the Greek text adopted by the Christians was received from Palestinian rather than Diaspora Judaism.

This leads us to the conclusion that the scriptures of Judaism circulated in Palestine in Greek as well as in their original Semitic languages. Unable to free himself from the divisions implied in the Alexandrian canon hypothesis, Torrey has postulated that the distinction in canonical practice was that of language, not geog-

[38] Ibid., p. 180. Cf. R. Weill, La Cité de David, Compte rendu des fouilles exécutée à Jérusalem, sur le site de la ville primitive. Campagne de 1913–14, (Paris, 1920), I, 186 ff.; II, Pl. xxvi.

[39] Op. cit., I, 124–128.

[40] K. Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, XX (Lund, 1954), p. 177.

[41] D. Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'Histoire de la Septante," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 18–29.

[42] Stendahl, op. cit., pp. 177–180.

[43] Int. to O.T., p. 66.

raphy.[44] But to suppose that one canon in Hebrew circulated throughout Judaism side-by-side with another canon in Greek is to make canonization meaningless. Moreover, Torrey's theory postulates that such a supposed division arose only after Jamnia. If those scholars, such as Orlinsky[45] and Torrey,[46] who think that the Jamnia canonization was a real canonization are right, then it appears that pre-Jamnia canonical practice in Palestine included closed collections of Law and Prophets, and also a large, undefined group of religious writings including the books later designated as "Writings" in the Jewish canon, the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and, perhaps, other writings now lost. The present writer suggests that it was this canonical practice, with undefined limitations in the third category, that obtained throughout Judaism before Jamnia, that was adopted as the scriptures of the early church.

Of corroborative importance to this discussion is the parallel use of the extra-canonical literature by the Qumran sect and the early Christians. For, as is well known, among the Dead Sea finds are not only texts of the Jewish canon and clearly sectarian writings but evidence in fragments and quotations of the apocryphal literature as well. Such writings as Jubilees, Enoch literature, Tobit, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, are represented in Hebrew and Aramaic texts.[47] And there are a host of fragments

[44] Op. cit., pp. 10–29.

[45] Op. cit., pp. 4–5, 7.

[46] Op. cit., pp. 14–15. Cf. H. Baratke, Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer (Berlin, 1953), pp. 9–14.

[47] Cf. C. T. Fritsch, "Herod the Great and the Qumran Community," JBL, LXXIV (1955), 174. W. H. Brownlee, The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, BASOR Supplementary Studies No. 11–12 (New Haven, 1951), p. 9. J. C. Trever, "Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from 'Ain Feshkha," BASOR, No. 115 (Oct., 1949), 8–10. B. J. Roberts, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Apocalyptic Literature," Oxford Society of Historical Theology, Abstract of Proceedings for the Academic Year, 1952–1953 (Oxford, printed for private circulation), p. 29. F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," Biblical Archaeologist, XVII (1954), 17–20. J. C. Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi en arméen. Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," Revue Biblique, No. 3 (July, 1955), pp. 398–406. Cross reports fragments from Cave Four written in non-Jewish scripts including two exemplars of the Old Septuagint. "A Report on the Biblical Fragments of Cave Four in Wâdī Qumrān," BASOR, No. 141 (Feb., 1956), pp. 9–13. But, wanting substantial finds of Greek and other non-Semitic texts, these fragments may represent manuscripts that chanced to fall into the hands of the Qumran community, perhaps through a proselyte who knew Greek, and were kept because they were writings of sacred texts. Unless it can be shown that these fragments were produced at Qumran it is not necessary to conclude from them that the community was multi-lingual.

of apocryphal texts not yet identified.[48] Here, then, are two Jewish sects, the one probably coming to an end in Palestine about 68 A.D., the other arising in Palestine subsequent to about 30 A.D. Both used the extra-canonical literature, the former in Hebrew and Aramaic, the latter in Greek. And we are now unable to distinguish between the use of this literature and the use of the books of the Hebrew canon in these movements.[49] Of course, there are those, such as Dupont-Sommer [50] and Cullmann,[51] who have suggested that there is a direct connection between the Qumran sect and Christianity because of the similarities between them. A direct connection between them, whereby a body of similarities between the Qumran sect and individual early Christians could be shown, would explain their parallel use of apocryphal literature. But no clear case of dependence, stronger than possibility, has come to light. A more probable explanation of their similarities is that they represent parallel developments arising under similar circumstances.[52] If this is the case, then some other explanation for the use of a common literature not included in the Hebrew canon is necessary. May not the most plausible explanation be that this extra-canonical literature found its way into the literature of both of these sects from its general circulation in Judaism before Jamnia? Corrodi rejected the possibility that the Christians adopted a sectarian canon because, he judged, the nature of the Christian movement and its use of scripture was such as to suggest that the Old Testament books in Christian use were received generally in Judaism.[53] But he believed that the Palestinian canon was closed before Christianity arose. This date has now been revised to about 90 A.D.,[54] i.e., subsequent to the rise

[48] Cross, op. cit., p. 20.

[49] The relation of Christian quotations and allusions from the extra-canonical Jewish literature has been mentioned above. For the Qumran usage cf. J. Carmignac, "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans 'la Guerre des Fils de Luminère contre les Fils de Ténèbres.'" Revue Biblique, LXIII (1956), 234–260, 375–390.

[50] A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford, 1952), pp. 99–100. Idem, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes (London, 1954), pp. 149 ff.

[51] O. Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," JBL, LXXIV (1955), 213–226.

[52] Burrows, op. cit., p. 328. H. J. Cadbury, "New Light from Old Scrolls," The Unitarian Christian, XI (1955), 9–12.

[53] H. Corrodi, Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Geschichte des jüdischen und christlichen Bibelkanons (Halle, 1792), pp. 114–115, 161–166.

[54] Pfeiffer, Int. to O.T., p. 64.

of the church. Since we have "in the mouth of two witnesses" evidence in Palestine for the use of a larger literature than that ultimately gathered into the collection of the "Writings," it seems plausible to postulate that this wider literature was used throughout Judaism before Jamnia. And in this respect Alexandria, and Hellenistic Judaism generally, followed the practice of Palestine. There was, then, no sharp division in the canonical practice between Palestine and the Diaspora, between the Hebrew and the Greek scriptures. The church adopted no distinctive canon from Alexandria. But, rather, the church adopted the full range of scriptures that commonly circulated throughout Judaism before the Jewish canon was closed at Jamnia.[55]

If such was the case, that the church did adopt the common canonical practice that obtained throughout Judaism before Jamnia, the problem then arises as to how Judaism and Christianity determined the final forms of their canons. The material that throws light on this question is too scant to offer certainty. But sufficient information is available to construct a plausible hypothesis.

As to the Jewish canon, the most probable view appears to be that the canon was closed in Judaism following the unhappy conclusion of the Jewish revolt in 70 A.D. Following that date a theory was evolved in Judaism, first attested in Josephus (Against Apion I.viii.41), that inspiration ceased in Israel after Ezra.[56] No books written since his time could be considered canonical. We are ignorant as to exactly how this theory was applied to obtain the known results. However, it does appear, since the bulk of the excluded literature was apocalyptic in nature, that the Jewish canon was closed to exclude apocalyptic literature.[57] Thus, at

[55] It should be noted that scholars such as Torrey (op. cit., pp. 10–29) and Orlinsky (op. cit., pp. 4–5, 7), without benefit of the Dead Sea finds, and Roberts (op. cit., p. 33), W. Baumgartner ("Die Bedeutung der Höhlenfunde aus Palästina für die Theologie," Schweizerische Theologische Umschau, XXIV (1954), 54) followed by Fritsch (op. cit., p. 48), in the light of these finds, approach the hypothesis herein presented. They, however, have been prevented from the conclusions here reached because they assumed the Alexandrian canon was a substantially fixed canon prior to the rise of Christianity. They suggest, therefore, that Hebrew (Palestinian) usage paralleled the Septuagint (Alexandrian) canon prior to Jamnia.

[56] Pfeiffer, Int. to O.T., p. 63. Cf. II Esdras xiv. 45–46, of about the same date as Josephus and B.T. Sanhedrin 11a.

[57] A. Jeffery, "The Canon of the Old Testament," The Interpreter's Bible, I

Jamnia the third category of Jewish religious works was limited and defined to include only the books we know as the Writings. These Writings, together with the previously determined collections of Law and Prophets, were declared the totality of Jewish scriptures; the writings we know as Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (and perhaps others now lost) were rejected from the canon.[58]

That the church determined the extent of its Old Testament canon is evinced in many ways. The canons of the Old Testament adopted by church councils in East and West about the end of the fourth and early in the fifth centuries [59] (and, though these councils were local councils, they probably represent common usage among the churches in their areas) differed from the Hebrew canon. The variety found in Old Testament lists in the church fathers [60] and the variation from place to place in extant Christian collections of Old Testament books [61] indicate the fluidity that once existed. The difference between these Christian Old Testaments and the Hebrew canon is in the inclusion of Jewish religious books in the Christian Old Testament that were rejected from the Hebrew canon. But in the church, as in Judaism, not all the Jewish religious literature that was available retained a place in the canon. The Jewish extra-canonical literature that retained a

---

(New York, 1952), 32–45; G. Hölscher, Kanonisch und Apokryph (Leipzig, 1905), pp. 38–64; Torrey, op. cit., pp. 14–15; A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament (Copenhagen, 1948), I, 28–29. G. F. Moore, "The Definition of the Jewish Canon and the Repudiation of the Christian Scriptures," Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects . . . to Charles Augustus Biggs (New York, 1911), pp. 99–125, and J. Bloch, "Outside Books," Mordecai Kaplan Jubilee Volume, English Section, ed. M. Davis (New York, 1953), pp. 87–108, argue that the Jewish canon was closed as an anti-Christian movement directed at the exclusion of Christian writings. But cf. L. Ginzberg, "Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue towards the Apocalyptic-Eschatological Writings," JBL, XLI (1922), 115–136, who, while answering Moore, is an effective refutation of Bloch as well. Ginzberg concludes that the Jewish canon was closed at Jamnia as an anti-apocalyptic movement.

[58] Cf. note 55 above.

[59] In the East at the Council of Laodicea (between 343 and 381 A.D.), cf. Mansi, op. cit., II, 573–574. For the Western councils cf. note 9 above.

[60] Swete, op. cit., p. 200; Ryle, Canon, p. 280. Jepsen, op. cit., pp. 65–74, correctly argues from these variations that the extent of the Christian Old Testament was determined within the church.

[61] Cf. Jefferies, op. cit., pp. 41–42, for a convenient description of these differences.

place in the Old Testament of the early church we have come to term the "Apocrypha"; the Jewish literature rejected from both Hebrew and Christian canons we term "Pseudepigrapha." But, since this entire literature was received by the church before the canon was closed in Judaism, we are confronted with the problem of how the church came to differentiate between Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. What were the criteria by which the church retained or rejected the Jewish extra-canonical books?

As with the problem of canonization in Judaism, the steps that led from the Old Testament as received from Judaism to the Old Testament as canonized in the church are not clearly discernible. Heretofore attempts to answer this problem have sought to do so by one single hypothesis. Thus, for example, Burkitt has conjectured that after a time apocalypses fell out of favor in the church, as they had in Judaism.[62] As the expectation of the speedy end of all things gradually faded away the church lost interest in apocalyptic writings. Therefore, Burkitt argues, the Old Testament canon was closed in the church, as probably also in Judaism, as an anti-apocalyptic movement. Jepsen, on the other hand, believes that the Old Testament received its form in the church as the collection of those books that contain the Word of God that points to Christ.[63] If before Christ the extent of the Writings remained unclear, after Christ clarity was found by asking, in what writings were the predictions of Christ to be found? While it does appear that the early Christian interest in apocalyptic faded and that a major interest of the early church in the Jewish religious literature was as a source of predictions of Christ, it does

[62] F. C. Burkitt, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses (London: Oxford University Press, 1914), pp. 11 ff.

[63] Op. cit., pp. 70–71. J. L. Koole, Het Problem Van De Canonistie Van Het Oude Testament (1955), pp. 30 ff., would determine the matter of the canon of the Old Testament on the theological grounds; what contained the Word of God was canonized as the Old Testament. The quality of containing the Word of God is self-evident in the books as compared with the Apocrypha. Likewise, B. M. Metzger's theory in An Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York, 1957), pp. 7–10, 171–180, reflects a dogmatic theological position argued at Princeton as early as A. Alexander, The Canon of the Old and New Testaments Ascertained (New York, 1826): the Word of God is self-validating. The Apocrypha are not and cannot ever have been canonical since there is no criteria for judging what is canonical except the Word of God. While Metzger denies an Alexandrian canon, he gives no reason for this. Consequently his position closely resembles (with only minor variations) the old dogmatic Protestant position before Kuenen.

not appear that either of these played a large rôle in determining the limits of the Old Testament in the church.

Katz has offered a theory wherein he seeks to account for the Christian usage by postulating that the Septuagint form of the Old Testament preserves a Palestinian ordering of the books that antedates the Jamnia decisions.[64] This early form may be recognized in the reckoning of twenty-two books in the Old Testament. First attested in Josephus, this form of the canon was preserved in Diaspora Judaism which was slow to adopt the reordering and tripartite dividing of the canon at Jamnia. Therefore, the so-called Alexandrian form of the Old Testament adopted by the church is, rather, a form in which the scriptures circulated in Palestine as well as in Diaspora Judaism. Church fathers who count twenty-two books in the Old Testament indicate thereby the influence of this old form in which, after the Law, the books were arranged according to their natural order.

Katz is right in pointing out the fluidity of canonical practice in Judaism before Jamnia. But, as indicated above, this fluidity probably consisted in a lack of any attempt to list canonical books in the third category rather than in a multiplicity of such listings. Probably no attempt to formally list the Writings was made until after 70 A.D. Further, it appears that Katz would too easily dispose of the rather strong evidence for closed collections of Law and Prophets and a tripartite division of the scriptures before Jamnia by simply stating, "The emphasis is on the whole and not on the parts . . . ." [65] Katz has not seriously considered the implications of the variations in the lists of the fathers, even among those who count twenty-two books, a variation that cannot be explained on the hypothesis of their representing a common ordering of twenty-two books. It is evident that Katz' theory does not adequately account for the variety of evidence bearing on our problem.

In attempting to understand the process of Old Testament

[64] P. Katz, "The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLVII (1956), 191–217.

[65] Ibid., p. 194. While treating those who account for a twenty-two book canon by assuming the influence of the Septuagint in a rather cavalier fashion (Ibid., pp. 212–217), Katz completely overlooks the effective answer to his position in E. König, Kanon und Apokryphen, (Gütersloh, 1917), pp. 45–46.

canonization in the church let us turn first to the fathers of the Eastern church. In doing so we, like Katz, are impressed with the enumerations of a twenty-two book Old Testament. These enumerations are usually accompanied by a statement that this number corresponds to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet and/or that the list is in conformity with the Hebrew canon. Our earliest Christian Old Testament list is from Melito, bishop of Sardis (c. 170 A.D.), and preserved in Eusebius, Church History (IV.xxvi.13). Melito's statement that he journeyed to the east "and reached the place where these things were preached and done" (*ἀνελθὼν . . . καὶ ἕως τοῦ τόπου γενόμενος ἔνθα ἐκηρύχθη καὶ ἐπράχθη*) [66] suggests that his information was obtained in Palestine. The absence of Esther may reflect a continued reservation on the part of Melito's informant concerning the canonicity of Esther, such as was observed in the discussions at Jamnia.[67] The absence of Lamentations, however, may be an inadvertent oversight similar to the absence of the book of the Twelve in Origen's list also preserved in Eusebius.[68] If so, then Melito's list would have totaled twenty-two books [69] and may be a clue to Josephus' method of counting a twenty-two book canon.[70] Also, Melito's list would parallel the contents of the Jamnia canon with the exception of Esther. It does seem probable that Melito intended to present a twenty-two book canon.[71] This was achieved by counting Kings as one work which, however, he knows as four books in the Septuagint form. Similarly, Chronicles, known to Melito in the Septuagint form as two books, are counted as one work. This

[66] K. Lake, Eusebius with an English Translation (Cambridge, 1926–1932), I, 392–393.

[67] Ryle, Canon, p. 215; Wildeboer, op. cit., pp. 77–78.

[68] Cf. discussion below.

[69] Lake, translating the entry concerning Solomon, *Σολομῶνος παραμίαι ἡ καὶ Σοφία*, as "The Proverbs of Solomon and His Wisdom," thus includes the Wisdom of Solomon in Melito's list (op. cit., I,393). However, in view of Eusebius, H. E. IV.xxii.9, *ὁ πᾶς τῶν ἀρχαίων χορὸς πανάρετον Σοφίαν τὰς Σολομῶνος Παροιμίας ἐκάλουν*, a reading like R. Grant's ". . . of Solomon, Proverbs (also called Wisdom)" (Second-Century Christianity (London, 1946), p. 71), seems more probable.

[70] Josephus' division, then, may well have been Law: Gen., Ex., Lev., Num., Deut.; Prophets: Josh., Judg., Ki. (I, II), Isa., Jer., Lam., Ez., Twelve, Ezra, Chr., Dan., Job, Ruth (or, if Josephus counted Esther, he may have counted Jer. and Lam. as one work [see below], and thus exactly have paralleled the contents of the Jamnia canon); Writings: Ps., Prov., Eccles., Song (there is no attempt here to suggest Josephus' order in the groups).

[71] Katz, op. cit., p. 196.

method of counting a twenty-two book Old Testament is known, also, to Athanasius,[72] Epiphanius,[73] Gregory of Nazianzus,[74] and Amphilochius.[75] These fathers expressly state that it is their purpose to conform the Old Testament to the Jewish canon. That is, they recognize that the Jews have an *a priori* claim on knowing the correct form of the Old Testament.

Another manner of counting twenty-two Old Testament books is found among those that include Esther. The Eastern fathers who include Esther compensate by counting works associated with Jeremiah under one title: so Origen,[76] Epiphanius,[77] Amphilochius,[78] and apparently Gregory of Nazianzus.[79] Yet another mode of numeration of the Old Testament is to be noted. Some of the Eastern fathers count Kings as two books. Where this is done twenty-two books are achieved by the agglomeration of Judges and Ruth: Origen[80] and Cyril of Jerusalem.[81] It will be noticed that while these represent three distinct forms of numbering the Old Testament as twenty-two books, two of these forms are frequently mixed in a given list. This suggests that, while the tradition of a twenty-two book Jewish canon was received from Palestine, no clear tradition of how the Jews arranged their scriptures impressed itself upon the Eastern church.[82]

Another matter that demands our attention in the Old Testament lists of the Eastern church is to be had in the inclusion in these lists of books not included in the Hebrew canon. These books are not the whole of the Apocrypha but only a portion of

[72] Ep. fest., xxxix, J. P. Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus . . . Series Graeca (Lutetiae Parisiorum: 1857–1866), XXVI, 1436–1437.

[73] Weights and Measures xxiii, Migne, op. cit., XLIII, 277–280. Lamentations does not appear in the list, nor is it counted with Jeremiah; it appears following the twenty-two book canon as *an additional canonical book*.

[74] Carmina i.12, Migne, op. cit., XXXVII, 472–474.

[75] Ad. Seluc., in Gregory of Nazianzus, Carm., II.vii, Migne, op. cit., XXXVII, 1593–1596.

[76] Eusebius, H. E. VI.xxv.2.

[77] Adv. Haer. I.i.8, Migne, op. cit., XLI, 213. Cf. Weights and Measures iv, Migne, op. cit., XLIII, 244, where only Jeremiah is mentioned.

[78] Cf. note 75 above.

[79] Carmina, I.xii.5, Migne, op. cit., XXXVII, 472–474. Here Esther is missing. However, Gregory names only Jeremiah and since he intends to give a twenty-two book list, it seems probable that Esther is inadvertently omitted.

[80] Cf. note 76 above.

[81] Catech. IV.35, Migne, op. cit., XXXIII, 497–500.

[82] Contrary to Katz, op. cit., p. 201.

them: two books of Esdras are listed, the second being the canonical Ezra-Nehemiah and the first, I Esdras of the Apocrypha. Also Baruch and the Epistle (of Jeremy) are named. Probably, also, upon comparing the usage of the fathers, Daniel and Esther should be understood as in their expanded forms. How is it that only this portion of the Apocrypha should be included in these lists? It appears that certain of the Apocrypha came to be associated in the Septuagint-Christian tradition with books that were included in the Hebrew canon. Thus I Esdras was joined together with canonical Ezra; the writings associated with Jeremiah tended to agglomerate: either Baruch with Jeremiah and the Epistle (of Jeremy) with Lamentations or all were gathered under the single title, Jeremiah. Likewise, in the Septuagint-Christian tradition the books of Daniel and Esther circulated in their expanded form. It was just these books among the Apocrypha that, in the Greek form used in the churches, were agglomerated under titles included in the Hebrew canon that are found in the lists of the Eastern fathers and that were included in the Old Testament canonized at the Council of Laodicea. This resulted when Old Testament lists received from Jews were corollated with the Old Testament according to Christian usage. A comparison of the Books in Origen's Hexapla [83] and the Hebrew names (transliterated into Greek) in his list of the Jewish canon [84] with the books named in Greek in that list shows clearly that this is what occurred.[85] It is here suggested that such an explanation plausibly accounts for the inclusion of the books named above in the Christian Old Testament.

The limitation of the Old Testament in the Eastern church to the Hebrew canon in a Greek recension, however, does not have the credentials of long established practice. The fact that the Eastern churches continued to use a Greek recension but confined it to the limits of the titles of the Jewish canon shows that the priority claims of the Jewish canon have only made a superficial

[83] Migne, op. cit., XV–XVI.

[84] Cf. note 76 above.

[85] Origen states clearly that it is the Jewish canon that he enumerates in this list. That he recognizes Christian usage differed from that of the Jews is shown in his letters To Africanus v, ix, xiii. Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, Origen's Doctrine of Tradition (London, 1954), pp. 133–137.

penetration into the church. The very need for publishing lists of the Old Testament books and the frequent commendation of these lists by the attraction of numerical coincidence with the Hebrew alphabet indicate the unsettled status of the Old Testament canon in the church. Moreover, fathers of the Eastern church continued to use in their writings books of the Apocrypha that do not appear in their canonical lists. Origen indicates clearly that he considered the Christian Old Testament to be more extensive than the Hebrew canon; [86] confinement to the Hebrew canon is suggested for Christians only for polemic purposes with the Jews.[87] But, while Athanasius and later Eastern fathers go further than Origen and insist that the Christian Old Testament should be confined to the canon of the Jews,[88] they do not so confine themselves in their writings. Quotations from other books of the Apocrypha are introduced with formulas identical or similar to those used to introduce quotations from the canonical Old Testament.[89] Epiphanius does not include Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon in his Old Testament list but he does include them at the end of his New Testament! [90] The canon of Muratori anticipates Epiphanius in this with respect to Wisdom.[91] It would appear, therefore, that the period of transition from a fuller to a more restricted Old Testament is to be observed among the Eastern fathers beginning with Athanasius. They have intellectually accepted the proposition that the Old Testament of the church should be limited to the Jewish canon (though corollated to the Greek recension) but this conviction has not been completely integrated into their use

[86] To Africanus ix. [87] To Africanus v, xiii. [88] Cf. above.

[89] Athanasius: Wisdom of Solomon i.45 (Letters iv.4); i.11 (Def. before Constantius v); ii.21 (Hist. of Arians lxxi); ii.23 (Incarnation of Word v); vi.18 (Incar. of Word iv); iii.57 (Defence of his Flight xix); vii.25 (Defence of Nicean Definition xi, On the Opinion of Dionysius xv); vii.27 (Lectures i.1; x.4); ix.2 (Discourse II.xix.45); xiii.5 (Against the Heathen xxxv); Ecclus. i.25 (Life of Anthony xxviii); iv.28 (Def. against the Arians xc); vii.25 (Def. before Constantius ii); xviii.17 (Letters xix.5); Esther iii.9; ix.21 (Letters x.11); Judith ix.15; xiii.8 (Letters iv.2); Tobit iv.18 (Def. before Constantius xvii) I Esd. iv.36 (Discourse ii.20); iv.40 (On the Opinion of Dionysius xxv); iv.41 (Def. before Constantius xi). Gregory of Nazianzus: Judith v.6 (Oration xlv.15); Wisd. vii.26 (Oration xxix.16–17); Ecclus. iii.12 (Oration xxxvii.18); II Macc. (Oration xliii.74–75). Cyril of Jerusalem: Wisd. xiii.5 (Lecture ix.2); Ecclus. iii.21–22 (Lecture vi.4).

[90] Heresies lxxvi, Migne, op. cit., XLII, 559–562.

[91] A. Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament (New York, 1913), p. 210.

of scripture. They continue to habitually use the larger Old Testament to which they had become accustomed before the impact of the Jewish canon came to be felt.

If the inclusion of the foregoing writings in the Christian Old Testament can thus be plausibly explained, what can be said of the remainder of the Apocrypha that continued on as canonical in the West: Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom of Solomon, the Maccabees, Tobit, and Judith? How did the church differentiate between these and the books we now call Pseudepigrapha? Until this division between books of the Apocrypha agglomerated with books of the Hebrew canon in the Greek recension used by Christians and the remainder of the Apocrypha is made, no adequate solution to the distinction between Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is possible. But since we have a tenable solution to the inclusion of I Esdras, Baruch, Jeremy, and the additions to Esther and Daniel, it may be possible to suggest a plausible hypothesis for the differentiation between the remainder of the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha.

We have suggested that the most probable of the theories for the closing of the Jewish canon is that the step was taken as an anti-apocalyptic movement in Judaism. The strength of this argument is that the apocalyptic literature was most strongly affected by the closing of the canon at Jamnia. The distinction between the books now before us is even more sharply that of non-apocalyptic and apocalyptic literature. The remainder of the Apocrypha are non-apocalyptic. For reasons not entirely clear to us they were not included in the Jewish canon. But apparently there was no animosity against these books in Judaism. Indeed, on the contrary, it appears that these books continued to enjoy circulation in Judaism even after the closing of the canon. Ecclesiasticus is quoted three times in the Talmud apparently as canonical.[92] Origen evidently knew I Maccabees in Hebrew and in the hands of Jews, though outside their canon.[93] Judith and Tobit were still obtainable in Hebrew from the Jews in Jerome's day.[94] The Talmudic concession that Ben Sira could be read as a letter [95] may

[92] B. T. Hagigah 13a; Yebamoth 63b; Baba Kamma 92b.
[93] Cf. note 76, above.
[94] Preface to Tobit; Preface to Judith.
[95] J. T. Sanhedrin x.1.

easily have been applied to this whole group of books. It is evident, then, that these books received no hostility and possibly were even cherished by the Jews after the closing of their canon. There are no similar mitigating factors for a single book of the Pseudepigrapha. The books composed in Greek and included in the Apocrypha can be accounted for by their being associated with books mentioned above similar to what was observed in the canon of the Eastern churches. Thus, Wisdom of Solomon was united with Ecclesiasticus; Augustine knew a tradition that attributed both to Solomon.[96] Similarly, II Maccabees was united with I Maccabees because of the similarity of contents.

It, therefore, appears that when the canon of Judaism was established as an anti-apocalyptic movement, certain non-apocalyptic books not included in the canon continued to circulate in Jewish hands. The Eastern church, following the Jewish canonical list, excluded these books from their Old Testament. However, the lenient attitude of the Jews toward these books resulted in their being retained in the Old Testament of the Western church.

The fate of the Jewish religious literature, largely apocalyptic, that found no place either in the Jewish canon or in the Christian Old Testament is obscure. Of these writings the Enoch literature made the strongest claim for canonicity and it, therefore, may serve to illustrate the lot of this entire literature in the church. R. H. Charles has traced the acceptability of Enoch (I) in the second and first centuries B.C. in Judaism and in the early centuries of the church.[97] He has shown that there are frequent citations of or allusions to Enoch in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs; and Enoch is also cited in the book of Jubilees.[98] This suggests that Enoch was regarded as inspired, at least in some circles, in Judaism during the second and first centuries B.C.[99] In Christian literature Enoch is cited as scripture in Jude (14–15), and in the Epistle of Barnabas (xvi.5). Enoch appears to be similarly regarded by Athenagoras (Supplication for the Christians xxiv), Irenaeus (Against All Heresies IV.xvi.2) Clement of Alex-

[96] On Christian Doctrine II.13.

[97] The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1913), II, 165.

[98] Ibid., loc. cit.

[99] Ibid., II, 165.

andria (Eclogae propheticae ii), and Tertullian (On Idolatry iv). It is evident that Enoch was held in high regard and was cited on an equal status with other Old Testament books by Christian writers into the third century. But in the third century opposition to the inclusion of Enoch appears in the church and, according to Tertullian (On Apparel of Women i.3), it was the non-inclusion of Enoch in the Jewish canon that led some Christians to object to its canonicity in the church. Origen represents an equivocal position toward Enoch citing it favorably in De Principiis (I.iii.3, IV.i.35) but discrediting it in his Against Celsus (V.liv). In Augustine's day Enoch was finally rejected from the Old Testament (City of God XVII.xxxviii) and Augustine uses Enoch as an example of the whole pseudepigraphal literature. It would, therefore, appear that the canon of the Old Testament took its form in the church as the resultant between the forces of Christian usage that tended to maintain a book as canonical in the church and the *a priori* claims of the Jewish canon that tended to restrict the Christian Old Testament to the limits of the Jewish definition of scripture.

"MARCIANUS" ARISTIDES, ON THE WORSHIP OF GOD

G. C. O'CEALLAIGH
New York, New York

Careful inspection of all external and internal evidence reveals that the Apology of Aristides, known since 1889 as the long-lost "earliest extant apology for the Christian Faith," mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome, was written by a proselyte to Hellenist Judaism, probably in the time of Hadrian, not as an apology for Christians at all, but primarily as a counterattack upon polytheists and their religious notions and secondarily, as a defense of the monotheistic worship and the morals of the Jews. This definitely Jewish work of the second century was interpolated and "edited" by a Christian writer, probably of the late fourth century, and was thus converted into what passed as an apology for Christianity.

This conclusion provides the answer to the enigmas of the Apology noted by many critics: the amazing "leniency" shown by its "author" toward the Jews; and the glaring contrast, in purpose, content and style, which exists between the two long passages that are so obviously Christian, and the great bulk of the basic work which is not.

Chief authority for the text of the Apology at present is the Mt. Sinai Syriac version of the seventh century, edited by Harris,[1] except for the two short fragments of the "original" Greek,[2] which, in the extent of their coverage, must of course be given preference. Both the long fragment in Armenian,[3] and the paraphrase of Euthymius,[4] appearing as the *pièce de résistance* in his Christian-

[1] J. R. Harris, The Apology of Aristides, in Texts & Studies, I, 1 (Cambridge, 1891).

[2] a) Cf. C. Wessely, Les plus Anciens Monuments d. Christianisme (II) in Patrol. Oriental., t. 18 (Paris, 1924), Supplement, p. 499 (= Oxyrh. pap. 1778 in A. S. Hunt, Oxyrh. Pap., v. XX, p. 159; b) Cf. H. Milne, A New Fragment of the Apol. Aristid., in Journ. Theol. Stud., v. 25, p. 73 (= Brit. Mus. Pap. Inv., no. 2486) reprinted by G. Krueger in Theolog. Literaturzeitung, 1924, no. 2, p. 47.

[3] Preserved in 4 Mss., the earliest, of 981. Cf. P. Martin, in J. B. Pitra's Analecta Sacra Spic. Sol., t. IV (Paris, 1883), pp. 6 ff., 282 ff. Cf. Harris, op. cit., pp. 26 ff.; and N. O. Emin, Transl. & Studies in Sacr. Armen. Lit. (in Russian) (Moscow, 1897), pp. 249–55.

[4] Euthymius' authorship, asserted by von Rosen, 1887; Hommel, 1888; established by F. C. Conybeare (Folk-Lore mag., v. 7 (1896), pp. 102–42); confirmed by P. Peeters, La Première Traduction Latine d. B & J, in Analecta Bollandiana,

ized version of the Buddhist legends (written probably between 990 and 1000) known as the Life of Barlaam and Ioasaph (or Josaphat), must be held as ancillary texts (as being of much later provenience).

Apart from the use made of the Apology by these three Eastern paraphrasers, there is but one early piece of external evidence that is pertinent, the passage in the Eusebian Church History[5] which reads, "Also Aristides, a faithful man, moved by (or, taking his departure from) the piety that characterizes us, like Quadratus, has left to posterity an apology on the faith addressed to Hadrian. This man's writing is also preserved by very many, even to the present time."

Eusebius had just finished describing the Apology of Quadratus, giving many details as to its contents, even quoting a lengthy passage, and declaring that he himself had a copy, as well as "many of the Brothers."

These two sentences on Aristides, then, are by contrast so brief, so non-committal, that most critics have agreed that it is very doubtful whether Eusebius had ever seen Aristides' work. Most have concluded he knew of it only "by hearsay."[6]

In any case, there is nothing in this notice to preclude the possibility that the Apology was in fact written by a Hellenist Jew,

v. XLIX (1931), pp. 276–312; corroborated by J. Sonet, Le Roman de B & J, 2 v. (1949–52). Cf. also R. L. Wolff, The Apol. of Aristid. in Harvard Theol. Rev., v. 30, n. 4. Euthymius, second abbot at Mt. Athos, died in 1028. (For Euthymius' text I prefer Mt. Sinai Gk. Ms. 392, prob. 11th C., but use also Boissonade's, whose prime source was Paris Bibl. Nat. Cod. 903, also 11th C.)

[5] Euseb., H. E. IV, 3 (Migne, PG 20): *Kai Aristeidēs de pistos anēr tēs kath' hēmas hormōmenos eusebeias, tō Kodratō paraplēsiōs, huper tēs pisteōs apologian epiphōnēsas Hadrianō kataleloipe. Sōzetai de ge eis deuro para pleistois kai hē toutou graphē.* All later references (in Jerome, Syncellus, Ado, Usuard) are admittedly derived from this and have no further knowledge of the Apology.

[6] E.g., R. Seeberg, D. Apol. d. Aristid. in Th. Zahn's Forschungen z. Gesch. d. nt. Kan. (Leipzig, 1893), p. 251: ". . . dass Euseb. dasselbe nicht gelesen hat. Euseb. hat also ueber die Apol. nach Hoerensagen berichtet." Cf. A. Harnack, Chronol. d. altchr. Lit. (Leipzig, 1897), p. 271: ". . . er scheint sich nicht die Muehe genommen zu haben, sie zu lesen"; and p. 272, n. 3: ". . . dass er das Buch nicht selbst gesehen hat." Cf. O. Bardenhewer, Gesch. d. altkirch. Lit. (Freiburg i. Breisgau, 1902), v. I, p. 172. Cf. A. Puech, Hist. d.l. Litt. Grecque Chrétienne (3 v., Paris, 1928), v. 2, p. 126: ". . . qu'il n'a parlé de ce dernier (i.e. Aristid.) que par ouï-dire." So also Dict. d. Théol. Cathol., v. 13.2 (1937), art. Quadratus, "Eusèbe n'a parlé que par ouï-dire du travail d'Aristide . . . ." C. Vona, L'Apologia di Aristide, in Lateranum, nov. ser., an. xvi (Rome, 1950), p. 5. (It should be noted that although Vona defines his Italian text as a "versione dal Siriaco" (meaning Harris' transcription of 1889) he nowhere refers directly to the Syriac.)

on behalf of that "piety" (*eusebeia*) toward "God almighty," which the Syriac gives as the subject in its title, that was common to both Jews and Christians. Eusebius says nothing that would preclude its being a polemic, such as we find it originally to have been, and which even now it remains, in its bulk, against the childish idol-worship of the pagans.

This *eusebeia* which Eusebius (self-consciously, no doubt) assigns to Aristides as the moving cause of his writing, Eusebius had most frequently seen used to refer to "Jewish piety." As an example, we may note the dozens of instances in which the word appears in that homily which Eusebius himself ascribed to Josephus, IV Maccabees.[7]

We conclude on this point, since Eusebius knew of the work only by its title, therefore only that it was either Jewish or Christian, his notice of the Apology does not preclude its being originally Jewish. We shall find corroboration of this conclusion in the variant titles of the work.

Turning now to the internal evidence and our chief document, the seventh century Syriac Ms. #16 of St. Catherine's Monastery, Mt. Sinai,[8] we note at once an important fact which Harris seems not to have mentioned, the caption is in two parts, distinguished by different colors of ink. Near the bottom of Folio 56r[9] the previous scribe ended[10] his "History of Nilus the Solitary." At this place, below a decorative spacer, a different hand writes the *rubric*:

TWB MPQ BRWḤ' D'BD 'RSṬDYS
PYLSWP' ÇYD HDRYNWS MLK': 'L
'P̈Y DḤLT 'LH':

[7] *Eusebeia* appears here more than forty times. Even in NT usage the word usually refers to basic Jewish piety, as Ac. iii, 12; 1 Ti. ii, 2; iv, 7–8; vi, 11; 2 Ti. iii, 5. And since the NT *sebomenos* (Ac. xiii, 43 et passim) is so closely cognate, yet always refers to a *Jewish proselyte*, it must be considered at least possible that a man named Eusebius thought of a *sebomenos* when he wrote, "pistos *anēr tēs . . . eusebeias*."

[8] Available since 1952 on microfilm. Cf. Libr. of Congr., Checklist of Mss. in St. Catherine's Monastery, Mt. Sinai, p. 17.

[9] Since Harris transcribed the Syriac text, 1889, the codex has lost 37 leaves from the front. He found the Apology on Folio 93.

[10] The first scribe had written in single column style. The secondary address and one line of the text bring our scribe to the bottom of the page. Turning over to 56v, he continues the Apology in two columns to the page, thus setting the style for the balance of the book, through Folio 204.

(Again the Apology which Aristides the Philosopher made to Hadrian the King on Behalf of the Worship of God (Almighty))

and then continues on, but now in the usual black ink:

'ḤYD KL QSR
ṬṬWS HDRYNWS 'NTWNYNWS . S̈GYD'
WMR̈ḤMN' . MN MRQYNWS 'RSṬDYS
PYLSWP' D'T̈NY' –:–

((Almighty) Caesar Titus Hadrian Antoninus, Worshipful (pl.), and Merciful (pl.), from Marcianus Aristides, philosopher of Athens –:–)

We know from the spot where this scribe changed the color of his ink, as well as from his punctuation, that he understood the words, *'ḥyd kl* (almighty), to refer to Caesar. But that the original applied them to God seems definitely established by the fact that the same phrase is applied to God in the Jewish section of the Apology.[11] We conclude, then, that either this scribe's original or the original of his *Vorlage* must have been written wholly in black, as one continuous title-address, with erroneous or no punctuation, and already must have contained everything that appears here, including the double address, the plural points (*seyāmē*) over "worshipful" and "merciful," and the conjunction "and" between them; and was already ungrammatical in form, since the names of Antoninus can be construed neither as in the dative nor as in the vocative case.

This duplex address in two colors gives us a striking picture, in miniature, of the present content and condition of the whole Apology, and supports our thesis in a remarkable manner. For plainly we see here in red the complete original title. It tells us the work is an "apology" written by "Aristides the philosopher," addressed to the Emperor Hadrian, on the subject "the Worship of God (Almighty)."

The ink changes its color. And suddenly we find that it is not to Hadrian the work is addressed, but to Antoninus, rather, to both of them at once, and that despite the fact that the Apology

[11] Chapter xiv, on the Jews, *'lh' brwy' dkl w'ḥyd kl* (God, Creator of all and Almighty).

opens with, "I, O King . . . ," and this singular apostrophe is repeated again and again throughout the work. We find also that our philosopher's name is "Marcianus" (a Roman name) and that he is an Athenian.

Harris and many following him worked hard to make sense out of all this, trying to favor the second address; and, while at first scholars tended to accept their hypotheses, of late years they began to return to solider ground. The cold facts remain:

1.) Neither Eusebius nor even Jerome had ever heard that Aristides' name was *Marcianus*, or that the Apology was addressed to any emperor but Hadrian.

2.) The Armenian mss. reject the secondary address, and stick to the title found in the Armenian translation of Eusebius' Chronicon, "Aristides, philosophus Atheniensis, (Imperatori Caesari) Hadriano."

3.) The Apology, from the opening sentence to the last page, continually addresses only one emperor, as "O King" (or "O Emperor"), except for certain plurals to be considered later, which appear in the Christian material.

The fact that the subject of the Apology, "On behalf of the Worship of God (Almighty)," follows the name of Hadrian in the first and older rubric, and *separates* the names of the two rulers despite the adjectives (meaning, *Sebastoi and Eusebeis*) which follow the second name; and the fact that the second address, if taken alone and the adjectives made singular, lacks all suggestion of the subject treated, and depends for whatever meaning it has on the rubric, also point clearly to a later interpolation.

Moreover, there is another circumstance, external to the evidence of the Apology, which confirms our conclusion. Eusebius and his copiers all link this Aristides with one Quadratus, also an Athenian, who likewise presented an apology to an emperor. And, as Harris noted, it was Jerome who first identified[12] this apologist Quadratus of Athens with that Quadratus who had been mentioned by Eusebius as "bishop of Athens" *during the reign of Antoninus Pius*. That identification, and the fact that Eusebius and Jerome never spoke of one apologist without the other, made it almost *de rigueur* that the Apology of Aristides should be ad-

[12] Cf. his Ep. ad Magn. (PL 22,667), *Atheniensis pontifex ecclesiae.*

dressed to Antoninus Pius as well as to Hadrian. And that conclusion points to an interpolator who was a contemporary of Jerome.

On this matter we conclude, Eusebius' report, with which the Armenian agreed, definitely dates the original Apology in the year 125–126, before the Jewish uprising under Simon Ben Kosebah[13] got into full swing. The emperor's presence in Athens at that time[14] would have given our Athenian proselyte to Judaism the inspiration to write it. The Syriac duplex address reflects the work of a much later Christian interpolator who also pluralized several apostrophes in his new material on the Christians.

Before discussing details of the work, we give here a bare comparative outline of the order of treatment, first, as it now appears in the Syriac-Armenian; second, in Euthymius' paraphrase. We also show the length of each section in terms of columns in the Syriac.

Outline

Syriac-Armenian	*Approximate Space Used*	*Euthymius*
(chap. i) Exordium	3 col.	Exordium
(chap. ii) Division of Subject: fourfold: "Barbarians," Greeks, Jews, Christians.	3 col.	Division of Subject: threefold: Polytheists (Chaldaeans, Greeks, Egyptians), Jews, Christians.
a) Statement of origins of Barbarian, Greek, Jewish and Christian "races."		
b) Christian Confession of Faith.		
c) Repetition of Division.		
d) Obedience of 4 Elements. (End of Armen. Frgmt.)		
(chaps. iii–vii) The "Barbarians."	8½ col.	The Chaldaeans.
(chaps. viii–xi) The Greeks.	12½ col.	The Greeks.
(chap. xii) The Egyptians.	4½ col.	The Egyptians.
(chap. xiii) Summary of Argument against Greeks.	4 col.	Summary of Argument against all Polytheists.
(chap. xiv) The Jews.	1½ col.	The Jews:
a) Charged with Angel-worship.		a) Diatribe against Jews.

[13] Cf. J. T. Milik in Rev. Bibl., 60 (1953), pp. 276–94.
[14] Cf. J. Duerr, D. Reisen d. Kaisers Hadrian (Wien, 1881), pp. 42 f., 70 f.

(chaps. xv–xvii) The Christians, their ethics and religion.	9 col.	The Christians: a) Statement of their origin. b) Christian Confession of Faith. c) Their ethics and religion.

The present Apology, as is evident, devotes twice as much space to its exordium, or even to its division of the subject, as it gives to the Jews whom it declares to be one of the four "races of men in the world." In fact the Egyptians, who are not even named in the division of races, are still given three times the space allotted to the Jews. And, as we shall see, actually more than *twenty-four* times as much room is devoted to the polemic against the Greeks, as is given to the errors of the Jews. This amazing paucity of anti-Jewish material in what has been accepted as a Christian apology should have alerted every critic who has handled it to the presence here of something preposterous.

An overall view of the work reveals at once the duplicity of its authorship. For while it contains sections in five of its seventeen chapters which obviously flaunt Christian insignia, the balance of the work, at least seven-eighths of it, reveals not one of the earmarks of the Christian writer. So striking is the contrast between the writing of the Christian passages and that of the balance, that Harris[15] came within a thought of our own conclusion. Although the author, he says, is *posing* as a philosopher, and approaches his subject in a very objective manner:

> . . . he soon breaks down; . . . the man *throws off his disguise* and gives the note of challenge. . . . He talks of angels as though all men knew them, dashes through the dogmatic statements of the Church as though they were perfectly familiar, and without a word of preliminary explanation of terms, makes a peroration of the impending judgment-day.

Harris should have asked himself why it is that the "author" *succeeds* in "posing as a philosopher" throughout the whole Apology except in the Christian portions, chapter ii, and the last large section, chapters xiv a–xvii. How could this author write as a

[15] Op. cit., p. 23. Others have exclaimed over the different styles: Puech, op. cit., p. 130; M. Pellegrino, Gli Apologeti Greci del II Sec. (Rome, 1947), p. 29, who finds the "ragionamento d'un filosofo" strangely commuted, and "il canto d'un poeta" emerging. Cf. Vona, op. cit., p. 25.

philosopher in chapter i; "break down" and "throw off his disguise" in chapter ii; suddenly resume his philosophical disguise in chapter iii, and maintain that disguise successfully through twelve chapters until he comes again to speak of his own faith, then suddenly again "break down" and rant about angels, church dogmas and a judgment day "as though all men knew them," and "as though they were perfectly familiar," and "without a word of preliminary explanation of terms"?

The answer seems too obvious to mention. The basic work is a Jewish Apology, which Geffcken and others already found protruding here and there.[16] The material on the Christians is about one-half taken from the basic author's treatment of the Jewish *mores*, one-half recklessly interpolated material.

In addition, then, to the impossible order of development and space-allotment shown above, and a host of minor inconsistencies, there are these four main reasons for concluding that no second-century Christian could have written the entire work as it stands: a) The fourfold (actually fivefold) division of the "races of men in the world," and the balance of chapter ii are wholly unacceptable as a writing of the second century; b) What little appears in the Apology anent the Jews is, in part, altogether too favorable to them and in another part is an outright contradiction of itself; c) The leading characteristics of the Christians are equally assigned to the Jews; d) The present form of the composition is manifestly corrupt.

Here is the text of the moot chapter ii, following the opening paragraph, as derived from the generally consonant texts of the Syriac and the Armenian:

(a) "It is clear to us, O King, that there are four races of men in this world: Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians.

(b) The Barbarians derive their race from Kronos and from Rhea and their other gods;

(c) but the Greeks derive their origin from Helen who is said to

[16] J. Geffcken, Zwei Griech. Apologet. (Leipzig, 1907), p. xl: "Gleichwohl haben wir es in Aristid . . . mit einer Apologie zu tun, die im ganzen ihrer Form nach noch mehr im juedisch-hellenistischen Lager als im eigentlich christlichen weilt"; and cf. p. 83. Cf. B. Altaner's art. in Klauser's Reallexikon f. Antike & Christent. (1950), v. I, pp. 652 f. Cf. Puech, op. cit., pp. 128 f.; Pellegrino, op. cit., p. 38, "Così l'apologia giudaica può aver lasciato le sue tracce."

be sprung from Zeus. And by Helen were born Aiolos and Xuthos; and others are descendants of Inachos and Phoroneos, and lastly of Danaos, the Egyptian, of Kadmos and Dionysos.

(d) The Jews, however, derive their race from Abraham who begat Isaac, whose son was Jacob. And Jacob had twelve sons, called the patriarchs, who migrated from Syria to Egypt; and there they were called Hebrews by their legislator. And departing thence into the Promised Land, they were at length called Jews.

(e) But the Christians derive their race from Jesus Christ;

(f) and He is confessed the son of the Highest God. . . . He came down from heaven and assumed flesh from a Hebrew virgin. . . . This Jesus was born from the race of the Hebrews, etc. (through the Confession of Faith, to be discussed later).

(g) So that, as we have shown, O King, there are these four races: Barbarians and Greeks, Jews and Christians.

(h) And the wind is obedient to God, the fire to the angels, the waters also to the demons, and the earth to the human race."

Euthymius, showing no respect for this effort of the Christian writer, corrected (a) to make his division of races agree with the actual content of the Apology as it came to him; threw out (b), (c), (g) and (h) as altogether useless; moved his version of (d) back to chapter xiv (on the Jews) whence the Christianizer had borrowed it; and rewrote (e) and (f) to act as his introduction to the Christians in chapter xv. We shall show that every separate section of the eight parts composing the above matter involves either an outright contradiction of the basic writing, or an error of negligence or ignorance that contrasts with the true Apology, or both, none of which can be accepted as an authentic writing of the second century. We consider each part separately:

(a) No emperor, in fact, no pagan Greek of that or any other period, would find "clear," or even tolerate this division of races. To all who understood Greek, *Barbaroi* included all races of the earth who understood no Greek, all who were *not Greeks* by culture. Even in the third century, as we know from the works of

Clement Alexandrinus and Origen, neither Greeks nor Christians thought of the Jews as separate from the Barbarians. In Greek writings Jews always appeared and were classified as a type or race of the Barbarians.[17]

Again, neither the emperor here addressed nor any Greek who might be expected to read this work, no, nor even a Christian at this time, would think of separating Christians from Jews in a work addressed to the Greeks. The references to the Christians (?) in Tacitus' Annals,[18] Epictetus' Discourses,[19] Suetonius' Life of Claudius,[20] Hegesippus' Memoirs,[21] Clement's Stromata,[22] and "Hippolytus'" Philosophumena[23] place this fact beyond dispute. Finally, since the "race of Christians" was composed of Jews, Greeks and Barbarians, it were a trifling absurdity to offer the Christians as a *race* distinct from all these components.

Beyond that, this fourfold division makes the grave error of omitting the Egyptians, to whom the original author devotes his long chapter xii and part of chapter xiii; who are there distinctly separated from both Chaldaeans and Greeks, and even definitely compared with them, to the detriment of the Egyptians.

(b) The statement that the "Barbarians" (i.e., all races of the earth which knew no Greek) trace their origin from "Kronos and Rhea" is in direct contradiction to the basic text which declares in chapter ix that the *Greeks* hold Kronos as "the first of their gods,"

[17] E.g., Josephus, Contr. Ap., "Apollonius . . . reproaches us as . . . the weakest of all the Barbarians." P. Casamassa, Gli Apologisti Greci, in Lateranum, nov. ser., an. ix–x (Rome, 1944), pp. 140 ff., aptly recalls that Tatian (To the Greeks) always uses "Barbarians" to signify "Jews and Christians," and in chap. 42 calls himself a philosopher of the Barbarians. Cf. Clem. Alex. Stromata V, xiv, 1, and esp. VI, vi, 1: ". . . *edothē nomos men kai prophētai Barbarois, philosophia de Hellēsi*," wherein no one can doubt these Barbarians are the Jews (and Christians).

[18] Annales, xv, 44 compared with his Hist., v, 3, shows the former refers to the "multitudo ingens" of Roman Jews.

[19] Discourses, II, 9, 3 on "real Jews" who are "baptized . . . circumcised."

[20] Cf. xxv, 4: "(Claudius) chased out of Rome the Jews who, impelled by one Chrestus, were continuously turbulent."

[21] Hegesippus (apud Eusebius, H.E. IV, 22) about the year 185, calls the Church "the Children of Israel," and declares, "in every city (including Rome and Corinth which he recently visited) the state of affairs is maintained in accordance with the Law and the Prophets."

[22] Cf. our note 17, and Stromata VI, ii, 1.

[23] Ref. of All Heresies, written after 233, at Bk. X, sec. 26–27, repeatedly divides the world into four races, placing the "worshippers of God" in one class, as "*of greater antiquity* than all Chaldaeans, Egyptians and Greeks," thus automatically precluding the thought of Christians, as distinct from the Jews.

and in chapter xi says Rhea is recognized *by the Greeks* as "the mother of their gods." It is impossible that our basic author could have divided the races deliberately into "Barbarians and Greeks" on religious grounds, and then have proceeded to show that the Greeks name as the first of their divinities those same gods from whom the Barbarians "trace the origin of their race." Of course the statement is an absurdity, in any case, and is patently a desperate expedient devised by the interpolator to provide a parallelism with section (d) which he had brought forward from chapter xiv of the authentic text.

(c) In this section on the Greeks, the writer has plainly confused the Helen who was spoken of in chapter ix as the offspring of Zeus and Leda, with the male Hellen, son of Deucalion and Pyrrha and the father, as he says here, of Aiolos and Xuthos. That he may have copied this error from the Stromata[24] does not excuse his ignorance, but it does place him in strong contrast to the comparatively erudite writer of the basic text. His addition here naming Inachos, Phoroneos, Danaos, Kadmos and Dionysos also reflects the Stromata[25] wherein Clement has all five in the same order.

(d) Both Syriac and Armenian texts state that the Jews, while in Egypt, were called Hebrews "by their legislator." But, for once, the error is not due to the Christianizer, but to injudicious mutilation of his text by the later Eastern Christians. We shall revert to this.

(e) In this context, to say the Christians derive their race from Jesus Christ, the Son of God, can only convey the idea that Christians are the "lineal descendants" of Jesus and so of God. But is that what the writer meant?

(f) This Christian Confession of Faith is wholly out of place in a context that is merely naming the divisions of the human race, preparatory to a consideration of the theology of each of them. Euthymius must have felt this when he moved his version of it back to chapter xv. It shows unseemly haste on the part of the interpolator to get in a "blow" for the Christians at the earliest

[24] Cf. Stromata VI, xv, ". . . if it was the case that the Hellenic dialects were named from Hellen, the son of Zeus, surnamed Deucalion, etc." Our Christianizer was again victimized by a corrupt text, it seems.

[25] Cf. Stromata I, xxi.

opportunity. He made his own opportunity and left a messy composition in his wake.

Moreover, this section contradicts both itself and what immediately preceded it. To the author's Greek audience, the concept of a god coming down from heaven would be in conflict with the statement immediately following, "Jesus was *born* from the race of the Hebrews." Beyond that, our writer who has just explained that the Jews and Hebrews are identical, now declares that Jesus was born from a Hebrew mother and from the Hebrew race. No one can doubt, therefore, that He was a Jew. But if the "race of the Christians" was fathered (as he intimates) by Jesus, a Jew, how can this writer think of classifying Christians as a different race from the Jews? He himself has now destroyed all basis for such a differentiation. He has now thrown his previous classification of races into the discard.

(g) This unnecessary repetition of the division of races points up the author's consciousness of having mutilated his basic text, and reveals at least a suspicion on his part that his efforts have been somewhat inadequate.

(h) The paragraph ascribing obedience of the four elements respectively to God, angels, demons and men is in direct contradiction to the spirit and wording of many passages in the basic text wherein, for example (chapter v), the wind exists "for the sake of men" who "*confine and keep it in check*"; and wherein fire is subservient not to angels at all, but to men, "and *is subject to them* in many ways." So also the waters, here in bondage to "demons" (whom he has not defined, any more than he has the angels), are in chapter v "created for the use of man, and are put *under his rule* in many ways."

The fact that "angels" appear only here and in the accusation of angel-worship against the Jews in chapter xiv, and that in both passages they are assumed to be well-known to all pagan Greeks, points to two interpolations by the same late hand.

Obviously, the author of this conglomeration of errors and contradictions is neither a "philosopher" nor an "Athenian"; and he lived at a time when Christians were much more numerous and widespread, and their dogmas and tenets much better known, than they were in the second century.

We now return to (f) above and make a further examination of the Christian "Confession of Faith." Accepting only those parts that are witnessed to by all three, or at least by two, of our sources, we have a resulting text which contains several phrases that came into vogue only in the late fourth century. This reconstructed "confession" reads thus:

> (Jesus Christ and) He is proclaimed the Son of the Most High God; by the Holy Spirit He came down from heaven and assumed flesh from a Hebrew virgin, and revealed himself as the Son of God. This is told in the writing called by them the Gospel, which you, if you will read it, may ascertain. This Jesus was born from the race of the Hebrews, and he had twelve disciples, in order that He might accomplish a certain (marvellous) dispensation. He was crucified by the Jews, died, and after three days rose up again, and ascended to the heavens. Thereupon his disciples went forth into all parts of the world preaching his greatness. Whence it is that even to the present day those who accept their preaching are called Christians.

Within the compass of this short passage, the writer did his best to give both the gist of the Gospel story, and the main elements in a creed that was his own rule of faith. His reference to the Gospel in his apostrophe to the emperor displays both his thought and his aim. We must not, therefore, treat this whole paragraph as we would the second section of a tripartite *formal Creed*. But that the author did actually draw upon the statements of such a creed is equally evident both from the material itself and from the fact that all three of the later Eastern writers, Syrian, Georgian and Armenian, most certainly treated it as such, and freely interpolated into it phrases from their own favorite creeds of those later times. This is too well known to need demonstration.

By removing from this text all references that were patently suggested to him only by the Gospels, the Acts, and later Christian history, we can re-establish the important elements of our writer's creed-text, thus:

> . . . Jesus Christ, the Son of God, (Who) by the Holy Spirit came down from heaven and assumed flesh from a . . . virgin . . . and after fulfilling a certain 'economy,' He was crucified, died . . . and after three days rose again, and ascended into the heavens. . . .

This residual text displays in a peremptory manner the fact that its author had a definite creed-form in mind, if not in writing before him, when he wrote the Christian Confession of Faith. A comparison of its elements with the texts of the well known *symbols* that have been preserved should give us an indication both of the general locality and the general period of our interpolator.

That which types this brief creedal text most surely is the compound expression, "came down from heaven and assumed flesh from (the) virgin." Our evidence for this is as follows:

Syriac: nḥt ('lh') mn šmy' wmn btwlt' ('bryt') šql (wlbš) bsr'.
Euthymius: ap'ouranou katabas . . . kai ek parthenou (hagias) . . . sarka anelaben.
Armenian: de caelis descendit, ex virgine (Hebraea) . . . carnem assumpsit.

The conjunction of these two notes, as here shown to be virtually identical in all three documents, makes it indubitable that this statement, in this same form, was written by the composer of the Christianized Apology. He was certainly familiar with a creed that contained it. That creed was, without the possibility of dispute, an Eastern one, for this statement appears in no Western creed-form.

Moreover, the statement finds its approximate duplicate only in three *Asian* creeds dating from about 380 to 451. We compare:

Apostolic Constitutions (composed most probably in Syria and often dated toward the end of the fourth century, but more likely of the fifth),[26] Book VII, chapter 41:

. . . katelthonta ex ouranōn kai sarka analabonta (kai) ek tēs (hagias) parthenou. . . .

Theodore of Mopsuestia,[27] writing between 400 and 428:

. . . katelthonta ek tōn ouranōn kai sarkōthenta (kai anthrōpon genomenon gennēthenta) ek (Marias) tēs parthenou . . .

The Council of Chalcedon's *symbolon* falsely[28] ascribed by some

[26] F. X. Funk, D. apostolischen Konstitutionen (Rottenburg, 1891) is the definitive work. Cf. esp. p. 366.

[27] A. Mingana, in Woodbrooke Studies V (Cambridge, 1932), pp. 186 f. (the Syriac), pp. 51 f. Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds (London, 1950), p. 187, for J. Lebon's Greek translation of the assembled Creed.

[28] Cf. Kelly, op. cit., pp. 296 f.

to the Council of Constantinople of 381, whose actual date is most probably 451, the year of the Council at Chalcedon:

> . . . *katelthonta ek tōn ouranōn kai sarkōthenta ek (pneumatos hagiou kai Marias) tēs parthenou* . . .

Our creed is evidently most like the first of these three, which is definitely the earliest, and may have been in vogue in Syria as much as a generation, or even two, before the Constitutions reached their present form. By this comparison our creed dates not earlier than 360.

But we note also that our text includes mention of the Holy Spirit in connection with the Advent, and this note, while present in the *symbol* of the Council of Chalcedon of 451, seems to have appeared in a formal Eastern creed for the first time at the synod of 360 at Constantinople. The creed promulgated at that time, according to Sozomen,[29] had the words, "came from heaven, (as it is written to dissolve sin and death) and was born from the Holy Spirit from Mary the Virgin according to the flesh, etc."

And since this creed and its first draft,[30] drawn up at Sirmium the year before, are the *only ones* that contain the words, "after fulfilling the (whole) economy (he was crucified)," corresponding to our creed's, "and after fulfilling a (certain) economy (he was crucified)," we have a further corroboration of the conclusion that our Christianizer lived and wrote after the year 360.

Finally, when we consider the peculiar position in the text, and the peculiar connection in which the "Holy Spirit" is found in our creed, without parallel, we believe, and weigh the further oddity, "after three days" which Euthymius has faithfully handed on, as verification of the Syriac, we are loath to believe this creed could have been written many years after the words "Holy Spirit" achieved their present place in any Eastern creed whatsoever; or after "on the third day" became the universally used wording. We therefore must conclude that our writer's time cannot have been later than the year 400. The anomalies here mentioned would place him in some backward community of the East, probably in Syria or Asia Minor.

[29] H.E. IV, 24. Cf. Kelly, p. 293.
[30] Ibid., pp. 288 f.

Now, we do not expect that all these conclusions relative to dating, from the creed-content of our interpolator, will be accepted literally. But certainly we can expect agreement upon this minimum, no Confession of Faith containing the elements we have established as found in this one could possibly have been composed even as early as the year 200, let alone a period seventy years earlier than that. And certainly no honest writer could have addressed this material either to Hadrian or to Antoninus Pius. The conclusion is inescapable that we are dealing here with an interpolation in the text of the work which was originally addressed to Hadrian.

Before leaving this section, chapter ii, we must point out how all three of our paraphrasers of the Christianizer's product bear witness, wholly contrary to their intention, to the *Jewishness* of the basic Apology. We compare their statements on the Jews:

Euthymius (chap. xiv)	*Syriac (chap. ii)*	*Armenian (chap. ii)*
(a)	(a)	(a)
They were descendants of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and they migrated to Egypt.	The Jews . . . trace the origin of their race from Abraham, who begot Isaac, of whom was born Jacob. And he had twelve sons who migrated from Syria into Egypt; and there they were named the nation of the Hebrews	The Hebrews derive their race from Abraham, whose son they call Isaac, and his son, Jacob. Of Jacob were the twelve patriarchs who migrated from Syria into Egypt, and they were named Hebrews
(b)	(b)	(b)
And thence God brought them forth "with a mighty hand and an uplifted arm" by Moses their lawmaker; and "by many wonders and signs" He made known His power to them.	by . . . their lawmaker,	by . . . their lawmaker.
(c)	(c)	(c)
(dropped)	and at length they were named Jews.	But at length, after they had entered into the Promised Land, they were called Judaeans.

Even if Euthymius' version of this passage were entirely unknown, it must be obvious to all that both the Syriac and the Armenian texts have two glaring faults: (1) they declare that the Jews were named Hebrews by Moses, for which, it would seem, there is no basis anywhere in literature; (2) having brought the Jews into Egypt, they do not bring them out. As far as the Syrian is concerned, the Jews are still in Egypt. And while the Armenian does have them entering a "land of promise," the pagan Greeks to whom this writing is overtly addressed, could not be expected to know that land was not part of Egypt.

It is evident that Euthymius abridged his *Vorlage* in section (a), dropped out the "twelve sons of Jacob," mention of Syria, and the variant name, "Hebrews." Having done that, he could well afford also to reject section (c) wherein the Hebrews again become Jews, for he alone has definitely brought them out of Egypt.

But in the section (b), Euthymius enables us to see at a glance why the other two are faulty. While Euthymius hands on their *Vorlage*'s quotations from Psalm 135 (vs. 11–12) and Psalm 134 (vs. 9) (LXX), as the Christianizer had done before him, the Syrian and the Armenian rejected both. Yet, foolishly enough, they both retained the phrase, "by . . . their lawmaker," which lay between the two Psalm quotations, and thus produced their strange and faulty text. The very flaws in their product betray their mutilations and establish Euthymius' text at this place as the authentic one, the *strictly Jewish* basic text.

Why did Euthymius retain a text which plainly depicts the Jews as the chosen object of God's loving-kindness? Simply because he had already tossed out *all of his* Vorlage*'s material on the Jews* except the two sentences given here (and one brief phrase to be looked at later). Had he also abandoned (b), as did the others, he would have been reduced to the one brief sentence in (a), as his complete material on the Jews!

And why did the Syrian and the Armenian shy clear of these laudatory Psalm quotations? No doubt they remembered Acts xiii, 17, wherein Paul declares, "The God of this people Israel chose our fathers, and *exalted the people* when they were sojourners in the land of Egypt, and 'with uplifted arm' brought them thence." They had no desire to "exalt the people Israel" while translating

a Christian apology aimed at condemning the Jews. And since the Syrian had saved one paragraph on the Jews from his original (in chapter xiv), which Euthymius deleted, he could better afford to cut the text at this spot.

Euthymius, despite himself, has handed on, in (b), a portion of the text of the basic work, one which "exalted the people Israel." Were it not so, the patent faults in the Syriac and the Armenian would be wholly unaccountable.

On the other hand, while both Syrian and Armenian approximate their *Vorlage* in (a), Euthymius has erroneously assumed that his audience already knew what relationship Isaac and Jacob bore to Abraham, and he omits the "patriarchs" who were essential to the migration to Egypt. Finally, in (c), thrown out by Euthymius, only the Armenian gives even a suggestion of the reason for the Hebrews' becoming known as *Ioudaioi*. Though still mutilated, it does give us a scrap of the original not to be found in the others.

We now return to our second main argument against a Christian authorship of the basic Apology. The material on the Jews is first, altogether too favorable to them and second, in direct contradiction with itself. This brings us to chapter xiv which is as follows in the two versions extant:

Syriac	*Euthymius*
(a)	(a)
(chap. xiv) Let us come now, O King, to the history[31] of the Jews also, and see what opinions they have as to God. (From this spot the Christianizer took his material on the Jews used in chap. ii, beginning, "the Jews trace the origin of their race . . . ," and ending, "they were named Jews.")	(chap. xiv) Let us proceed then, O King, to the Jews also, that we may see what truth there is in their views of God. For they were descendants of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and migrated to Egypt. And thence God brought them forth, etc. . . . (to) He made known His power to them.
(b)	(b)
	But even they proved stubborn and ungrateful, etc. (through a diatribe recognized by most critics as a new interpolation, ending) And they perished by their own transgression; for to this day

[31] Harris (others agreed) thought this word, *šrb'* (story, history) was a mistake for *šrbt'* (race), but the ms. admits of no doubt. The Christianizer cut down a long dissertation on the Jews, but forgot to alter this word to conform.

(chap. xiv cont.) The Jews then say that God is one, the Creator of all, and Almighty, and that it is not right that any other should be worshipped except this God alone. And herein they are seen to come much nearer to the truth than all the nations, in this more especially, that they worship God and not His works. And they imitate God by the love of mankind which prevails among them; for they have compassion on the poor, and they release the captives, and bury the dead, and do such things as these, which are acceptable before God and well-pleasing also to men, which (customs) they have received from their forefathers.

they worship the one God Almighty,

(c)

(chap. xiv cont.) Yet even they wandered away from true knowledge.

but not according to true-knowledge. For they deny that Christ is the Son of God; and they are much like to the heathen, even though they may seem to make some approach to the truth from which they have removed themselves. So much for the Jews.

And in their minds they suppose that it is God they serve; but by the kinds of their rites it is to the angels and not to God that their service is, . . . when they observe Sabbaths and the new moons and the feast of unleavened bread, and the great fast, and the fast, and circumcision and the purification of meats, which things not even thus do they observe perfectly.

It is section (b) above, in the Syriac, that has amazed both Jews and Christians, because of its "leniency" to the Jews. Harris,[32] Raabe,[33] Geffcken[34] and others have all exclaimed upon this point.

[32] Op. cit., p. 13, calls this "one of the surprising things," and continues, "one certainly would not suspect that the chasm between the Church and the Synagogue had become as practically impassable as we find it in the middle of the second century. . . ."

[33] R. Raabe, Die Apologie des Aristides aus dem Syrisch. uebers., in Unters. ueber d. Edessenische Chronik of L. Hallier (Leipzig, 1892), p. 57, suggests that it is because of this puzzling "friendly spirit toward the Jews" that the B & J author had to rewrite the text at this point. Raabe (pp. 32 f.) suspected two authors.

[34] Op. cit., pp. xl f.

And Geffcken[35] even rightly guessed that this material emanated "from a Jewish Apology." He did not realize that he had the bulk of that very apology, in however corrupt a form, lying before him.

That this paragraph is found at all in a writing ostensibly Christian places its authenticity beyond dispute. But, incidentally, as the Syrian and Armenian betrayed the true text by their injudicious mutilations in chapter ii, so here, by a partial excision, Euthymius betrays the fact that he recognized this material as much too Jewish to be found in his own work, and that he tried to whittle it out. For, inadvertently, he quotes the first phrase of section (b), "They worship the one God Almighty," then runs down to the first phrase in section (c), "but not according to true-knowledge," then proves that he had the whole paragraph before him, with his, "even though they may seem to make some approach to the truth," which is a mere negative paraphrase of the remark, "they are seen to come much nearer to the truth than all the nations," embedded in the authentic text.

It cannot be denied that all the matter in this section (b) in the Syriac was written originally to extol the virtues of the Jews, that it actually does so now, and consequently that it could not, and in an apology for the Christians most certainly would not, have been written originally by a Christian.

Again, as is obvious, Syriac section (c) is in violent contrast to what immediately precedes it:

(b)	(c)
The Jews say God is one, the Creator of all, Almighty; that it is not right that any other should be worshipped except this God alone. . . . They worship God, not His works.	. . . it is to the angels, and not to God that their service is (rendered) . . .
. . . They are seen to have come much nearer to the truth than all the nations. . . .	They . . . wandered away from true knowledge. . . .

It is wholly unreasonable to believe that these two sections on the Jews were written by the same hand. The second portion (c) is clearly an interpolation, made by a Christian in a non-Christian text.

[35] Cf. our note 16.

But what was the Christian's source for the charge of angel-worship? We can at once eliminate the Origenian Contra Celsum[36] and Celsus' work itself, for there we find, first, that Celsus considers the homage of angels as quite in keeping with the Mosaic Law; second, that he complains of their refusal to worship *the sun and the moon*; three, that his source always linked this angel-worship with "incantations and sorcery," but never with Sabbath, feast and fast observances.

The only other early writing containing this charge is the Stromata[37] of Clement Alexandrinus, which we have already seen to have been reflected in several other parts of the Christianizer's work. We now place the Stromata passage (quoting "Peter's Preaching") alongside "Aristides":

Stromata (Book VI, chapter v)	*Syriac "Aristides"* (chapter xiv)
And that the men of highest fame among the Greeks knew God, *not according to true-knowledge*. . . . Peter says in the *Preaching*, "Know then that there is one God, etc. . . ." signifying that the excellent among the Greeks worshipped the same God as we, *but not . . . according to true-knowledge*. . . . They (Greeks) are carried away by ignorance, and know *not* God (as we do, *according to the perfect knowledge*). . . . And that it is said that we and the Greeks know the same God, though not in the same way, he (Peter?) will infer (*sic*) in this place how, "Neither worship as the Jews, for they, supposing they only know God, do not know Him, serving, as they do, angels and archangels, the month and the moon. And if the moon is not visible, they do not observe the Sabbath that is called the first; nor do they observe the new moon, nor the feast of unleavened bread, nor the feast, nor the great day.	(Euthymius: They (Jews) worship the one God Almighty, but not according to true-knowledge. . . .) Syriac: They (Jews) wandered away from true knowledge, and in their minds they suppose that it is God they serve, but by the kinds of their rites, it is to the angels, and not to God their service is, when they observe Sabbaths, and the new moons, and the feast of unleavened bread, and the great fast, and the fast, and circumcision and purification of meats, which things not even thus do they observe perfectly.

[36] Contr. Cels. I, 26; V, 6–8.

[37] Cf. VI, v, *epoisei palin hōde pōs: mēde kata Ioudaious sebesthe; kai gar ekeinoi, monoi oiomenoi ton Theon ginōskein, ouk epistantai, latreuontes aṅgelois kai archaṅgelois, mēni kai selēnē, kai ean mē selēnē phanē, sabbaton ouk agousin to legomenon prōton, oude neomēnian agousin, oute azuma, oute heortēn, oute megalēn*

The three phrases: "not according to true (or perfect) knowledge"[38] which we have italicized in the above excerpt from the Stromata are, without exception, as all critics admit, the words of Clement himself, and not part of the quotations from Peter's Preaching. All of them refer to the Greeks.

But this frequently repeated idea is definitely quoted by Euthymius' rendering, with "they worship the one God . . . but not according to true-knowledge"[39] (the words in the Greek are identical), and is paraphrased in the Syriac wherein the accusation of angel-worship is introduced and concluded with the phrases, "They *wandered away* (erred) *from true knowledge*,"[40] and "which things . . . they *do not observe perfectly*."

These likenesses, taken in conjunction with the identity of the charge of angel-worship itself, and its fumbling connection of that idea with "Sabbaths, new moons, feasts," make it indubitable that it is this text of the Stromata which furnished our Christian interpolator with his source. He even uses a similar tautology. Where his source had, "the feast of unleavened bread, nor the feast, nor the great day," using redundantly *ta azuma* and *heortē*, both of which generally refer to the Jewish passover, "Aristides" says, "the feast of unleavened bread, and the *great fast*, and *the fast*. . . ."

Use of the Stromata is obvious. It is idle to try to go a step beyond this and seek to link this text, as Robinson[41] and many others have done, with the hypothetical Preaching of Peter which, for the most part, is known to us only *through the Stromata*, and, in any case, furnishes fewer resemblances to the text.

---

hēmeran. The passage in the Origenian Commentary on John, xiii, 17, cuts and paraphrases the Stromata text and connects it with Heracleon, but has no connection with Jewish holy days or with the idea, "not in accordance with true knowledge."

[38] Clement's words are: a) *ou kat' epignōsin*; b) *all'ou kat' epignōsin*; c) *hōs hēmeis kata tēn gnōsin tēn teleian*.

[39] Euthymius has, *all' ou kat' epignōsin*, identical to b) above. (Rom. x, 2 has this same phrase, but no faintest suggestion of either Jewish angel-worship or a reference to Jewish feasts and fasts. On the contrary, Paul, in the same breath, bears witness to Israel's "zeal for God," which is certainly incompatible with angel-worship.)

[40] To confirm our decision as to his source, the Christianizer uses this phrase, *yd'ī' ḥtytt'* or its equivalent, again and again, in chaps. xv, xvi, xvii.

[41] J. A. Robinson, The Remains of the Orig. Gk. Apol. Aristid., in Appendix to Harris' work, Texts and Studies, I, 1, built very extensively on this erroneous idea. Others thought the PP had been used, but not to the extent conceived by Robinson.

Due to space limitations, we must here by-pass many pertinent considerations on this matter of angel-worship, such as Origen's refutation[42] of the charge, Jerome's[43] linking it with Paul, through misinterpretation, etc., and content ourselves with concluding that since our Christianizer here again used the Stromata, he must have lived and written after the year 220.

Our third main reason for denying the Christian authorship of the basic Apology is also connected with the material already quoted on the Jews, and is this: all the characteristics assigned the Jews in chapter xiv are also described, in chapter xv immediately following, as characteristics of the Christians. There is hardly any break between the two "races."

Said of the Jews (chap. xiv)	*Said of the Christians (chap. xv)*
The Jews then say that God is one, the Creator of all and Almighty; and that it is not right that any other should be worshipped except this God alone.	They know and believe in God. . . . Who has no other god as fellow, the Maker of heaven and earth. They do not worship strange gods.
And herein they are seen to have come much nearer to the truth than all the nations, in this more especially, that	The Christians . . . have come nearer to the truth . . . than the rest of the nations.
they worship God, and not His works.	They do not worship idols in the image of man.
And they imitate God by the love of mankind which prevails among them;	They love one another, and show kindness to those near to them. Whatever they would not have others do to them, they do not to others.
for they have compassion on the poor;	From widows they turn not away their face; they rescue the orphan. . . . He who has gives to him who has nothing.
and they release the captives;	If . . . any of their number is imprisoned . . . all provide for his needs, and if possible, they get him released.
and bury the dead;	When one of their poor dies, each gives for him . . . and sees carefully to his burial.
and do such things as these, which are acceptable before God, and well-pleasing also to men;	They live holily and righteously as also the Lord their God commanded them. (They do not commit adultery . . . nor

[42] Cf. our note 36, texts cited.

[43] Cf. his Respons. ad Quest. ab Algas. Propos.

	bear false witness, nor embezzle a deposit, nor covet what is not theirs.)
. . . they observe the great fast and the fast,	If there is among them a man that is needy, and they lack means, they fast two or three days to supply (him). . . .
. . . and (they observe) purification of meats.	They do not eat meats consecrated to idols, for they are pure.

No Christian, writing an original apology for the Christians, would think of placing the Jews on a precise par with those of his own faith in so many important particulars. It is impossible to accept all this as an original Christian writing. And if one were to ask, why did our Christianizer, and the Syrian translator in turn, feel bound to retain statements so clearly making Jews equal to Christians, the answer is simply this, just as Euthymius passed on a text which "extolled the people Israel" because that was virtually all he had left of the original material on the Jews, so now, if the Christianizer or the Syrian had deleted this paragraph, they would have had *nothing left at all* to refer to the Jews from the basic material, for the Christianizer had already purloined the great bulk of Jewish material to laud the Christians!

And that brings us to our fourth main argument favoring a basic Jewish author. The present form of the Apology is obviously corrupt. While the bulk of the work, chapter i and chapter iii through chapter xiii, forms a very systematic and methodically developed polemic by a monotheist against three heathen races, the Chaldaeans, Greeks and Egyptians, the parts treating of the Christians, chapter ii, and the last three chapters, xv through xvii, are characterized by an entire lack of method or good compositional form.

The basic author has carefully divided his polemic into the three compartments, one for each of the three polytheistic races, and he deliberately employs the same method of development in each. That method calls for three distinct parts in each compartment, made up of: a) a synoptic opening paragraph embodying the gist of his argument against the particular race treated; b) a more lengthy and detailed *expansion of the same argument*; c) a brief closing statement.

In the first compartment, devoted to the Chaldaeans, chapter iii forms the section a), the gist of his argument against them. Then

comes the detailed expansion of the same, in chapters iv through vii, with his conclusion occupying the last sentences of chapter vii.

So, with the Greeks, chapter viii gives the gist of his argument, chapters ix through xi form the second part, b), and a concluding statement, c). And while only the long chapter xii is given to the Egyptians, this chapter, nonetheless, is distinctly composed of the same three parts, the gist, the expansion, and the conclusion.

Then, after using chapter xiii to summarize his arguments against all three polytheistic nations, and to refute sundry objections that might be raised by any of them, the author proceeds to treat of the Jews, which in his division of the subject he had named as one of the four "races of men in the world." But if this author were a Christian, he must look upon this compartment as a *continuation of his polemic*, and he would naturally handle it just as he had the other three races above. And we must find the same three elements in this compartment: a) the gist of his argument against the Jews; b) a detailed expansion of this same argument; c) a concluding statement. He would then be ready to take up the Christians.

But what do we actually find? Only this: a summary paragraph listing the *true beliefs* and the *laudable ethics* of the Jews; and, in direct contradiction of that paragraph, a weak complaint that they worship angels while *believing* they are serving God! If the first paragraph be accepted as the basic author's part a), the gist of his argument on the Jews, then the second, on angel-worship, is positively an interpolation, for it is absolutely strange to the author's method. But where now is the natural follow-up for a), the lengthy, detailed, expansion of a)? It seems to be missing, as well as the usual conclusion on the Jews. Instead of that, the writer has suddenly dropped the Jews, wholly contrary to his method, and we find him in the midst of a long itemization of the manners and morals of the Christians, involving, as we pointed out above, a long parallelism between the characteristics of the Jews and those of the Christians, in virtually the same order.

What happened is obvious. All we need do is drop a few interpolations labelling the "race" treated in chapter xv as "Christians," and we shall have recovered the bulk of the original detailed expansion, b), of the *same elements* sketched in the opening section

a), lauding *the Jews*. This conclusion explains, first, why the "Christian" material now runs on, practically without a break, from the Jewish material; second, why there is now such an amazing paucity of material anent the Jews; third, why the Jews are spoken of in section a) so kindly; fourth, why we find the *same characteristics* assigned to both Jews and Christians; fifth, why the Christian chapters are so plainly an amorphous cento.[44]

Finally, were we to retain any vestige of doubt as to the truth of our conclusions in this study, the Christianizer himself would soon dispel such doubts. For in *all three* of his largest interpolative passages he has left his plain sign manual, plural forms of address which, in themselves uniform, are in bold contrast to the real Apology. Here is the evidence:

Address and Apostrophes in the Singular	*Address and Apostrophes in the Plural*
A. The *original rubric*, addressed to Hadrian alone.	A. The secondary address, including Antoninus, labelling the two rulers as "worshipful and merciful." Tx: *sgyd' wmrḥmn'*, both with *seyāmē*.
B. In the Body of the Work:	B. In the Body of the Work:
chap. i: O King Tx: *'w mlk'* (always in sing.)	
	chap. ii (Introducing Christians)
	1: to *ye* Tx: *lkwn*
chap. ii, 2: O King Tx: *'w mlk'*[45]	2: to *ye* " *lkwn*[45]
	4: also *ye*, if *ye* read therein, *ye* shall perceive. . . . Tx: *d'p 'ntwn, 'n tqrwn bh tdrkwn* . . .
chap. iii, 2: O King Tx: *'w mlk'*	
chap. iv, 1: " " "	
chap. v, 2: which (thou) dost grant Tx: *'ylyn dmps' ('nt)*[46]	chap. v, 2: *your majesties* Tx: *mlkwtkwn*[46]

[44] Virtually all the critics have remarked this botched text. Among the latest, Pellegrino, op. cit., p. 29, observes, "Il maggior disordine si nota dove si parla dei cristiani. . . ."

[45] This interpolation now reads, ". . . *to ye*, O thou King. . . ."

[46] This interpolation gives the reading, ". . . which thou, *your majesties*, dost grant. . . ." Anent this *mlkwtkwn* Harris (op. cit., p. 57) declares, "This phrase, 'your majesty,' does not in any way suggest that more than one person is addressed." Since he tried, against all the evidence, to establish Antoninus as the *only* emperor addressed, this remark is not surprising; nor is the fact that he ignores all other plural apostrophes in the text. We would ask Harris, if this *were* addressed to two emperors, would it be any different from *mlkwtkwn*?

c. vii, 1: As thou thyself art convinced, O King
Tx: *'yk dmps 'nt 'p 'nt 'w mlk'*
2: O King Tx: *'w mlk'*
chap. viii, 2: " " "
chap. ix, 1: " " "
3: " " "
chap. xi, 7: " " "
chap. xiii, 1: " " "
3: " " "
chap. xiv, 1: " " "
chap. xv, 1: " " "
2: " " "
chap. xvi, 1: " " "
2a: " " "
2a: thou may'st learn
Tx: *mškḥ 'nt dnd'* (*sic*)

chap. xvi (treating the Christians)
2b: (to) *your majesties*
Tx: *lmlkwtkwn*
3: Take *ye your* (*sic*) writings and read *ye* therein . . . *ye* shall find. . . .
Tx: *sbw ktbykwn wqrw bhwn . . . mškḥyn 'ntwn*

chap. xvii, 1: (O) King Tx: *mlk'*
2: O King " *'w mlk'*

There are seven occurrences of address or apostrophe in the plural, as against twenty-two in the singular. Of the six plural apostrophes, five are found *only* in the two portions treating of the Christians, the other being a definitely ungrammatical interpolation in the section on the Chaldaeans, where the Christianizer probably had to patch his *Vorlage*. All these plurals in the second person stand in lurid opposition to the basic treatise as a whole, which was most manifestly addressed to a single emperor.

This evidence, in the light of all that we have already adduced, forces us to conclude: first, that all these plurals are to be attributed to the same hand; second, that the hand was that of a reckless Christian interpolator who interlarded his material into a non-Christian basic apology; third, that, unlike the simple *O King*, found so often in the basic work, these plural apostrophes patently are part and parcel of the Christian's material, and can only have been written in by him; fourth, since the basic text is monotheistic from start to finish, it can only be a *Jewish Apology*; fifth, since

several apostrophes in the singular are still found in the interpolated parts, portions of the basic text are to be found interwoven there. The time and place of the Christian interpolator have been handled above.

A MANUSCRIPT OF TOURS WITH AN ALCUINIAN *INCIPIT*

LUITPOLD WALLACH
State University of New York
Harpur College, Endicott, New York

E. K. RAND tentatively ascribed the Paris MS B. N. 4404, s.IX, to the Scriptorium of Tours which he reconstructed in the monumental studies in the Script of Tours.[1] Bruno Krusch[2] offered a detailed description of this manuscript which Theodor Mommsen[3] used for his edition of the Theodosian Code. The MS contains a collection of Roman and Germanic law codes and sources of law. Here we are especially interested in the Lex Romana Visigothorum, also called the Breviarium Alaricianum, and in the Salian and Ripuarian Codes, i.e., sources of law used in the Frankish Empire of Charlemagne. Some capitularies of Charlemagne, issued during and after the year 803, are attached at the end of the MS, which occupies an important place in the much discussed text transmission of the Lex Salica.[4] Turonian provenience of the MS has been denied by Philippe Lauer, Bruno Krusch, Wilhelm Köhler,[5] and C. H. Beeson, but Rand assumes that it deserves a listing among the books of Tours, since its script[6] "seems nearer to that of Tours . . . and yet . . . none versed in manuscripts has ascribed the book to Tours." Rand's classification, which is based on palaeographical evidence, finds some support by the presence in the extensive *Incipit* of lines which parallel Alcuinian verses:

[1] E. K. Rand, A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), 116 f., no. 45; cf. pp. 21 and 45. E. K. Rand and L. W. Jones, The Earliest Book of Tours (Cambridge, Mass., 1934), 86 consider Turonian origin for another MS of the Breviarium Alaricianum, the Vatican Reginensis 1128. But Th. Mommsen and P. M. Meyer, Theodosiani Libri XVI, t.II (Berlin, 1905), XLII assign this MS to the tenth, and not to the ninth century.

[2] Neue Forschungen über die drei oberdeutschen Leges (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, phil.-histor. Klasse, N. F. XX, 1; Berlin, 1927), 180–188.

[3] Op. cit., t.II, 1 (Berlin, 1905), LXXI; t.II (1905), XXXVIII.

[4] Bruno Krusch, Die Lex Salica (Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen; Berlin, 1934), p. 2.

[5] In his review of Rand's first volume (see above note 1) in Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen 193 (1931), 325.

[6] E. K. Rand, 'A supplement on Dodaldus,' Speculum VI (1931), 591 f.

Incipit in Paris B. N. 4404, s.IX, f.3: [7]

'Incipit textus librorum legum.'
'*In hoc dicta conduntur summi* multorum *mystica.*
Hoc corpus sacrum, lector, in ore tuo,
Quod nunc a multis constat codix istius dictatus.
Ex corpore Theodosiani libelli XVI.
Theodosiani iuniore novellarum unum.
Valentiniani Aug. libellus nempe.
Martiani, Maioriani, Severi et Gai,
ubi non sonunt interpretes.
Paulus sententiarum libelli quinque.
Gregoriani consonant simili libelli quinque.
Hermogeniani, Papiani cum sententiis tres.
Postmodum in hoc volumine continet scriptus
Pactus Salicae libellus unus.
Seu et Alamannorum et Ribuariorum.
Et edictus Childeberti regis.
Et domino nostro Karolo imperatore.
Edictus eiusdem extremus scribitur.
Hos lege tu, lector felix, feliciter omnes.
Et tu qui legis peregrini mei in bonis memento,
Dilectissime frater.'

Lines 2, 3, and 4 of this *Incipit* are parallel with vv. 2, 3, 5, and 11 of the following poem found at the very end of some MSS of Alcuin's recension[8] of the Vulgate edited by him with the approval of Charlemagne.[9] See MGH, Poetae I, ed. Ernst Dümmler, no. LXV, 1 (p. 283) and Ia (p. 285): [10]

'Nomine pandecten proprio vocitare memento
Hoc corpus sacrum, lector, in ore tuo.
Quod nunc a multis constat bibliotheca dicta
Nomine non proprio, ut lingua pelasga docet.

[7] The *Incipit* is published by Gustav Haenel, Lex Romana Visigothorum (Leipzig, 1849), XLIV, no. 4; by Mommsen (above note 3), and by Krusch (above note 2, pp. 181–182).

[8] The *Phi* class of MSS in the Vatican edition of the Vulgate: Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem, I ed., H. Quentin (Rome, 1926), XL.

[9] Cf. F. L. Ganshof, 'La révision de la Bible par Alcuin,' Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance IX (1947), 7–20.

[10] Although separately printed by Dümmler, loc. cit., the two versifications form one poem; see the text of the poem printed by F. Madden after British Museum Add. 10546, s.IX, in The Gentleman's Magazine VI (London, 1836), 472 f.

5 *In hoc dicta* dei *conduntur mystica summi.*
11 *Codicis istius* quot sunt in corpore sancto
Depictae formis litterulae variis:
Mercedes habeat Christo donante per aevum
14 Tot Carolus rex, qui scribere iussit eum.
Haec dator aeternus cunctorum, Christe, bonorum,
Munera de donis accipe sancta tuis,
17 Quae pater Albinus devoto pectore supplex
Nominis ad laudem obtulit ecce tui.
Quem tua perpetuis conservet dextra diebus,
Ut felix tecum vivat in arce poli.
Pro me, quisque legas versus, orare memento,
22 Alchuine dicor ego, tu sine fine vale.'

Line 19 of the *Incipit* is identical with v. 17 in the second Prologue of Alcuin's Bible recension: [11]

'Hos lege tu, lector felix, feliciter omnes.'

Line 20 'peregrini mei' has been variously interpreted. Mommsen prints *Peregrini* as a proper name with a capital letter, Wilhelm Wattenbach [12] and Bruno Krusch with an initial small letter as a mere noun. W. M. Lindsay [13] lists *Peregrinus* as the scribe of the codex, thus overlooking the fact that the name of the scribe is *Audgarius* (see below). But neither the *Pilgrimsmann* of Krusch nor the *Peregrinus* of Lindsay is identical with the scribe of the MS. 'Peregrini mei' is just a simple reference of the scribe to the MS he wrote; he calls it his pilgrim or wanderer.

The manuscript's scribe gives his name *Audgarius* in a monogram on fol. 214b.[14] But he is not mentioned among the fratres of Tours in the list of the prayer association of St. Gall,[15] as are other Turonian scribes. The corruption of vernacular terms in the Audgarius copy of the Barbarian Codes led Krusch to the questionable assumption that the scribe of these Germanic law books was a Romanus by birth, i.e., a Gallo-Roman, who was not well-versed in Germanic dialects. But badly read and misspelled

[11] See Biblia Sacra (above note 8), p. 51; MGH, Poetae I, p. 287, no. LXVII, 17.
[12] Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter (3rd ed., Leipzig, 1896), 495.
[13] Notae Latinae (Cambridge, England, 1915), 472.
[14] G. H. Pertz redraws the monogram in Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde VII (1839), 734: *Audgarius nomen.*
[15] In MGH, Libri Confraternitatum.

Germanic words are not incompatible with the obviously Germanic origin of the scribe *Audgarius*, whose name could well be a Latinized form of *Otgar* or the like.[16]

The verbal parallels between the *Incipit* of Paris 4404 and the verse of Alcuin could be explained on the basis of some scribe's casual familiarity with Alcuin's poem, which he found in some MS of the Alcuinian recension of the Bible. On the other hand, the parallels could indicate the possible Turonian provenance of the Paris MS, in which case the *Incipit* would carry the trademark of the Scriptorium of Tours during the time of Alcuin or shortly afterwards.

The Turonian descent of the Paris MS, designated N by Mommsen in the edition of the Theodosian Code, finds support in excerpts from the Lex Romana Visigothorum in two letters of Alcuin, one addressed to an unknown Frankish bishop, the other to his friends Witzo and Fridugis at the court of Charlemagne. One reading in Alcuin's excerpts coincides with N.[17] Yet since N offers no equivalent at all for another variant [18] in Alcuin's corresponding excerpt, N cannot be the manuscript used by Alcuin, though N might well be derived from it. N and Alcuin's excerpts from the Breviarium Alaricianum seem to be traceable to the same codex of the Code (X), which, according to the Turonian *Incipit* of N, was written at Tours. That N might stem from such a MS is also proved — at least to a small degree — by its contents. Krusch seems to overlook in his appraisal the fact that N contains *more* than is promised in the *Incipit*. The last item in the table of contents (see above) is listed as 'edictus (scil. Karoli) extremus scribitur.' The singular tense of the verb might indicate that X contained just one capitulary — that of the year 803, but not the others transmitted in N. The main scribe of N

[16] Many possibilities are listed by Ernst Förstemann, Altdeutsches Namenbuch (2nd ed., Bonn, 1900), 193.

[17] Alcuin, Epist. 245, D.396.20 f. (MGH, Epistolae IV) reads in the date line of an edict: 'DATA . . . ANTIOCHO ET BASSO CONSULIBUS.' The name of the second consul also in MS N. See Brev. Alaric. IX, 34, 1 = Codex Theod. IX, 45, 4 ed. Th. Mommsen, t. I, 2 (1905), p. 524, 6–7, and *apparatus criticus* ad loc.: 'antiocho et basso conss. N'; the original date line does not read *et basso*.

[18] Alcuin, Epist. 245, D.396.26 reads in the protocol of an edict: 'Ciciliano'; neither this corrupt reading nor the correct CAECILIANO is found in N. See Mommsen, Cod. Theod. t. I, 2 (1905), p. 442, 1 and *apparatus criticus*: 'Caeciliano *om.* N.'

wrote the *Incipit* and everything listed in the table of contents up to fol. 231b, but not the capitulary of 803. This imperial mandate and the others in the codex were written by another, but contemporary scribe. The reference to 'domno nostro Karolo *imperatore*' assigns the writing of X plainly to the years after 800. Since X contained — according to the *Incipit* — the capitulary of 803, and the second scribe of N did not include an earlier capitulary but two which were issued [19] between 803 and 815, X was probably written between 803 and 804, the year of Alcuin's death. Thus the post-Alcuinian origin of N is certain, and the capitularies added by the second scribe of N to the one of 803 which he found in X place the writing of N by the first scribe between the years from 804 to 814, a period that has been suggested by W. M. Lindsay. Palaeographical evidence seems to be against a later date. These conclusions agree with Mommsen's dating of N assigned by him to the beginning of the ninth century. Wilhelm Köhler [20] was inclined to date the codex about the year 805, while Krusch [21] prefers the middle of the ninth century.

Rand's ingenious classification of Paris B. N. 4404 as a Turonensis [22] and the internal evidence adduced by us permits the addition of the codex to the already known post-Alcuinian MSS of the Scriptorium of Tours.

Alcuin's poem 'Nomine pandecten proprio vocitare memento' (see above) offers an interesting instance of interpolation and recension the like of which Ludwig Traube [23] found in the transmission of other poems by Alcuin.

Dümmler based his edition of the poem on the Vallicellianus B. 6, from the end of the ninth century (V); for vv. 15–22 he relies on the transmission of a Regensburg MS (R) used by an earlier editor of Alcuin's poems. V seems to offer a revised text and not the original version, which is seemingly preserved in a

[19] According to Boretius, MGH, Capitularia Regum Francorum, I.

[20] See E. K. Rand, 'How many leaves at a time,' Palaeographia Latina V, ed. W. M. Lindsay (St. Andrews University Publications XXIII, 1927), 59.

[21] Op. cit. (above note 2), p. 182.

[22] See the summary of the present status of research dealing with Tours and the Carolingian minuscule by Hans Foerster, Abriss der lateinischen Palaeographie (Bern, Switzerland, 1949), 158–176.

[23] Karolingische Dichtungen (Berlin, 1888), 46 ff.

better fashion in British Museum Add. 10546 (B), the so-called Moutiers-Granval Bible, which Rand dates from 820–830 [24] and Wilhelm Köhler a decade or two later. F. Madden [25] assumes a revision of the poem's original text in V and the preservation of the genuine text in B. Dümmler prints after V,

v. 14 'Tot Carolus rex scribere iussit eum,' instead of the original text as in B:

v. 14 'Is Carolus qui IAM SCRIBERE iussit eum.'

On the other hand, MS V reads, according to Madden and Migne (PL CI, 728A), in v. 17: 'Quae tibi devoto Carolus rex pectore supplex,' while the genuine text of R is correctly adopted by Dümmler:

v. 17 'Quae pater Albinus devoto pectore supplex.'

The contention of Madden that B preserves the more original text of v. 14 finds some support from Alcuin's poem, which allegedly adorned the entrance to the Scriptorium at Tours and where we read in v. 11 (p. 320),

'Est opus egregium sacros IAM SCRIBERE libros.'

Alcuin's poem 'Nomine pandecten' is used like a literary formula in the Bible MS Paris B. N. 15176 from the eleventh century, whose scribe substituted ODILO ABBA for *Carolus* in v. 14, and FRANCO (in Greek letters) for Alchuine in v. 22. The hybrid origin of the codex, listed as W in the Vatican edition of the Vulgate,[26] not only offers Alcuin's shorter and longer metrical prologues of his Bible recension, but also introductory matter characteristic of the Bible recension by Theodulph of Orléans. Leopold Delisle thought that Paris 15176 came from the region

[24] E. K. Rand, 'A Preliminary Study of Alcuin's Bible,' The Harvard Theological Review XXIV (1931), 330 no. 31. Cf. L. W. Jones, ibidem XXVIII (1935), 135–179.

[25] 'Alchuine's Bible in the British Museum,' The Gentleman's Magazine VI (London, 1836), 468–477. On the history of the Vallicellianus see A. Rais, 'Une mise au point: La Bible de Grandval dite d'Alcuin,' Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique suisse XXVI (1932), 145–153. Bonifatius Fischer, Die Alkuin Bibel (Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 1; Freiburg im Breisgau, 1957) excludes the non-biblical MSS of Tours from his investigation.

[26] Biblia Sacra, op. cit., p. 2: W,s.XI: see ibidem, pp. 44–51, Alcuin's shorter and longer prologues to his Bible recension.

of the Moselle river, but its decorative materials now suggest to Jean Porcher [27] Aquitanian provenance.

The classification of Paris Lat. 4404 as a post-Alcuinian Turonensis is finally supported by the suggested relationship, rather ingeniously outlined by Karl August Eckhardt,[28] of a letter by Alcuin in August 798 addressed to Charlemagne, and a new recension of the so-called 100 Titles-Text of the Lex Salica that probably originated between January and August 798. The internal connection established by Eckhardt between the Long Prologue to the Salian Code in the D version of the Paris MS and the Alcuin letter that probably refers to changes made (in the Long Prologue) by the E redactor of the Code, now seems to present more than a mere working hypothesis.

[27] 'Bible Mosane où Bible Aquitaine?,' Scriptorium VI (1952), 93 f.

[28] Lex Salica: 100 Titel-Text (Weimar, 1953), pp. 12, 62–65, 76. Rudolf Buchner, Textkritische Untersuchungen zur Lex Ribvaria (1940; reprinted Stuttgart, 1952), 60 f., concludes that Paris 4404 is 'etwas jünger als 814.' Buchner in 'Kleine Untersuchungen zu den fränkischen Stammesrechten,' Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters IX (1951), 71 is not aware of the fact that E. K. Rand (see note 6, above) had changed his mind concerning the provenance of the MS. See further Buchner's note 28, p. 400 in Aus Verfassungs- und Landesgeschichte: Festschrift . . . Theodor Mayer II (Lindau-Konstanz, 1955), about various datings proposed for the Lex Salica portion of the MS. In the brilliant edition, jointly undertaken by R. Buchner and Franz Beyerle, of the Lex Ribvaria (MGH, Legum Sectio I: Legum Nationum Germanicarum III, 2; Hannover, 1954), Buchner (p. 33 f.) concludes that Paris 4404 belongs to the years 800–814, although he believes that the fact itself cannot be proved.

A CONTROVERSIAL TREATISE — BAILLET'S DE LA DÉVOTION À LA SAINTE VIERGE

LEONARD J. WANG
Rutgers University
(Newark Division)

Adrien Baillet, an erudite priest who was librarian and preceptor in the house of the distinguished magistrate Chrétien-François de Lamoignon from 1680 till the time of his death in 1706, was one of the most prolific writers of his time. A Cartesian and a Jansenist, the author of substantial biographies and histories, voluminous critical compendiums on both secular and theological subjects, and provocative religious treatises, and the center of some of the stormiest quarrels of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, he is today unknown to nearly everyone except specialists in his period. Many of the latter, moreover, are acquainted only with his massive biography of Descartes (1691) and his nine volume compendium Jugemens des scavans (1684–1686), an incomplete composition calculated to evaluate the principal works composed in all fields of human endeavor since earliest times as well as the judgments of their critics. The present study concerns one of the most obscure and at the same time most explosive of Baillet's works, his treatise on the cult of the Virgin Mary.

During the month of December 1692 Baillet heard Père Bourdaloue, the celebrated Jesuit orator, deliver a sermon on the conception of the Virgin. Mme. de Lamoignon, whom he had accompanied to the service, asked her husband's librarian to comment on what they had heard. Baillet declined to discuss so important a subject without first giving it his serious consideration, but promised her an answer in writing. Baillet was as good as his word. During the next weeks he composed a brief treatise De La Dévotion à la sainte Vierge et du culte qui lui est dû, which he dedicated to Mme. de Lamoignon. Completed by February 1693, it was published in April of the same year.[1]

[1] De La Dévotion à la sainte Vierge et du culte qui lui est dû, Paris, Cellier, 1693. The story of the origin of Baillet's treatise on the Virgin is related in the generally reliable Abregé de la vie de Mr. Baillet composed by Baillet's nephew Augus-

The cult of the Virgin had enjoyed greater popularity during the first half of the seventeenth century than at any time since the Middle Ages. Patronized by the Oratory of Cardinal Bérulle and by other pious groups, it had gained in prestige and had acquired many new adherents. By the middle of the century, however, it had also become infested with a number of exaggerations, chief among which was the tendency to accord to the Virgin the love, honor, and respect to which God alone was entitled. These practices were ridiculed by the Protestants and viewed with growing concern by many Catholic theologians and laymen. Pascal was the first author of note to suggest that the time had come to institute reforms. In his ninth Lettre provinciale, composed in 1656, he held Père de Barry and his Jesuit associates primarily responsible for the abuses which he observed in the cult of the Mother of God. Pascal's indictment of the Jesuits was upheld by Nicole. Montalte (Pascal), he asserted in 1658, was completely justified in criticizing Père de Barry

> . . . de cela qu'il promet le salut éternel à ceux qui pratiquent quelques légères dévotions extérieures. Car je passe sous silence que cet auteur, de même que plusieurs autres écrivains semblables, sépare tellement le culte que l'on rend à Marie de l'amour de Dieu, qu'il semble, à les entendre, qu'il soit permis d'en demeurer à Marie et que nous ne soyons pas obligés de rapporter à Dieu l'honneur que nous lui rendons. . . Ce sont ces excès qui ont donné occasion à toutes ces questions absurdes et ridicules qui sont le scandale de l'Eglise et le sujet des railleries des hérétiques.[2]

For his part, Bossuet, whatever his differences with the Jansenists, fully agreed with them that "l'honneur que l'on rend à la sainte Vierge (devait) être blâmé, s'il n'était pas religieux, c'est-

---

tin Frion and published in Jugemens des savans sur les principaux ouvrages des auteurs, revûs, corrigés et augmentés par M. de La Monnoye, Paris, C. Moette, 1722, I, 3–28. See the Abregé, pp. 20–21. It is to be noted that the sermon on the conception of the Virgin which Baillet heard was not the one that is published in Bourdaloue's works. The published sermon concludes with a passage complimenting the king on the marriage of his grandson, the Duc de Bourgogne, to Marie-Adelaïde de Savoie. This marriage took place in 1697, nearly five years after Baillet had written his treatise. See Sermons du Père Bourdaloué de la compagnie de Jésus. sur les mystères, 1709, II, 1–52.

[2] Cited in Henri Bremond, Histoire du sentiment religieux en France, Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1932, IX, 253. Also see ibid., pp. 247–288, passim.

à-dire, s'il ne se rapportait pas à Dieu, qui est l'objet de la religion." [3]

Agitation for reform of the cult of the Virgin continued to mount during the third quarter of the century. In 1673 it reached its culminating point with the publication of the Monita salutaria B. V. Mariae ad cultores suos indiscretos. This work, the product of Adam de Widenfelt, a German Catholic from Cologne who was reputedly a friend of the Jansenists, scathingly denounced the abuses which had slipped into the cult of the Virgin, and branded them as idolatrous. Translated into French and published in 1674 under the title of Avis salutaires de la sainte Vierge Marie à ses dévots indiscrets, Widenfelt's work became the center of many stormy discussions among French theologians. His remarks appeared to some sound and legitimate, and to others blasphemous and heretical. Between 1674 and 1679 the Avis were defended and condemned in some forty published works, chief among which are the Lettre pastorale of Gilbert de Choiseul, bishop of Tournay, and La Véritable Dévotion envers la sainte Vierge établie et défendue, by the Jesuit Crasset. In January 1678 the work was put on the Index.[4] Though condemned, Widenfelt's criticisms did not go without effect. During the 1680's many of the abuses which he had censured tended to disappear, and a purer form of devotion to the Virgin to be reinstated. These improvements, however, did not satisfy everyone. Among those who remained discontented was the Augustinian Adrien Baillet, for whom the purity of the cult of the Virgin could be reinstated only by an unqualified return to the teachings and traditions of the primitive Church. Deviations from these ancient traditions, he believed, led ultimately to idolatry and superstition. It was then his purpose in writing his treatise on the Virgin both to purge her cult of all unfounded practices and to indicate to the faithful how they could best serve the Mother of God.[5]

[3] Ibid., p. 254.

[4] See ibid., pp. 254 ff. According to Bremond, Bourdaloue's sermon on the "Dévotion à la Vierge" is probably a reply to the pastoral letter of Gilbert de Choiseul.

[5] The news that Baillet was planning to publish a work on the Virgin was first announced by the Protestant journalist Basnage de Beauval. "Mr. Baillet," he wrote, "va mettre sous la presse un Traité de la *Devotion raisonnable envers la*

Baillet's treatise comprises three parts. In Part I, "Du Culte de la sainte Vierge qui consiste dans les sentimens du coeur & de l'esprit," he points out to the faithful that their love of the Virgin, to be legitimate, must be deeply rooted in their love of and devotion to God. All prayers to the Virgin must have God as their end. Prayers meant for the Virgin alone are idolatrous. Baillet deplores and censures the unenlightened zeal of those Catholics who, throughout the ages, had invested the Virgin with the titles and honors due only to God himself, and who, without authorization, had superstitiously deified the creature to the detriment of the Creator. Asserting that the essential function of the Virgin is to intercede with her son Jesus Christ in behalf of our salvation, he concludes that titles such as Mediatrix, Co-Redeemer, and Mother of Grace and Mercy, which her devotees had lavished upon her, can be sanctioned only insofar as they are consonant with that function.

Part II of Baillet's work, "Du culte de la sainte Vierge qui consiste dans les prières publiques, & les pratiques extérieures de dévotion," discusses the origin, purpose, practices, and ceremonies of the festivals consecrated to the Virgin. Baillet distinguishes between the festivals which are authorized by ancient tradition and those whose legitimacy is questionable, and which are tolerated by the Church only as a benevolent concession to the faithful who had instituted them. In addition, he calls for greater spiritual devotion to the Virgin. He reprimands those Catholics who naïvely believe that they need only use their rosaries and scapulars diligently in order to assure their ultimate salvation:

> Si la chose étoit ainsi, ces marques exterieures d'un culte purement arbitraire auroient un privilége que les sacremens mêmes de l'Eglise n'ont pas. Ce seroit pour nous un parti beaucoup plus commode & plus assuré que celui des aumônes, des jeûnes, & des autres bonnes oeuvres que Jesus-Christ nous a prescrites, & qui ne laisseront pas de nous devenir inutiles si elles ne sont accompagnées & produites par la charité. Si l'usage de ces marques exterieures ne vient d'un mouve-

---

Sainte Vierge, & du culte qui lui est dû. Ce Traité, à ce qu'on dit, est dégagé de beaucoup d'opinions populaires. Il n'est pas favorable à ceux qui ont quelque pente à la superstition, ou qui font un trafic sordide de la devotion. Ce n'est qu'un *in* 12, de 13. ou 14. feuilles." Histoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, February 1693, p. 274. See ibid., May 1693, p. 522.

ment du S. Esprit, & d'un desir sincere d'imiter les vertus de la sainte Vierge, & s'il ne se trouve joint à une pieté vraiment interieure, c'est moins une devotion chretienne qu'un Pharisaïsme qui fait qu'on se fie à des signes établis par la simple imagination des hommes & qu'on présume de son salut par leur moien.[6]

Baillet concludes the second part of his composition with a double reprimand, addressed to those Catholics whose devotion to the Virgin consists solely in showering her images with presents and offerings, and to those who believe that the Virgin is more propitious to her followers in one place than to those in another. His remarks concerning the latter are particularly noble and eloquent. It is wrong he says:

. . . de laisser croire aux simples que selon la diversité des lieux, la S. Vierge seroit differente d'elle même; que Notre-Dame de Lorette seroit autre que N.D. de Mont-Serrat, que N.D. de Hall ou de Montaigu seroit plus puissante ou plus favorable aux hommes que N.D. de Liesse ou des Ardilliers. C'est être encore charnel que d'avoir plus d'attache & de complaisance pour l'un de ces lieux que pour un autre. L'esprit du christianisme qui est également répandu par toute l'Eglise ne peut souffrir ces contestations & ces basses jalousies, qui font qu'en voulant préferer un pelerinage ou une image miraculeuse de la sainte Vierge, pour laquelle on aura beaucoup de devotion à une autre pour laquelle on en aura moins, c'est sa propre satisfaction ou soi-même que l'on cherche plutôt que l'honneur de la sainte. La vanité qui nous porte naturellement à vanter nôtre pays, nos moeurs, nos usages, au préjudice des autres nations, entre facilement dans nôtre Religion. Nous nous glorifions d'un pélerinage ou d'une autre dévotion à la sainte Vierge établie chez nous plutôt qu'ailleurs comme si nous contribuions à sa gloire, comme si nous devions partager avec elle l'honneur qui peut luy revenir du culte & de l'affluence des peuples. Dieu peut quelquefois manifester sa puissance ou même la faveur dont il honore la sainte Vierge en un lieu plûtôt qu'en un autre: mais sans blâmer la dévotion particuliére que cette vûë pourroit inspirer, nous n'en devons conclure autre chose, sinon que c'est luy seul qui selon le temoiguage (sic) de l'Ecriture, opere toutes les merveilles qui se font par tout sans qu'il soit obligé de nous faire connoître les raisons de la diversité qui paroit dans sa conduite.[7]

[6] De La Dévotion à la sainte Vierge et du culte qui lui est dû, pp. 222–223.
[7] Ibid., pp. 237–239.

In the last and briefest section of his work, "Du Culte de la sainte Vierge qui consiste dans l'imitation de ses vertus," Baillet proposes the Virgin as the model of all devout Catholics. There is, he asserts, no better way to honor her than to be as she was — simple, pure, humble, full of faith in God, submissive and obedient to God, free from vain curiosity and affectation, and detached from the things of this world. He concludes with a brief parallel between the noble solitary life of Descartes, who in his eyes was both emancipator of the human mind and defender of the faith, and that of the Mother of God.

Upon its appearance Baillet's treatise enjoyed a "succès de scandale." To the Protestants it represented a triumph. "Rien ne semble justifier mieux les reproches des Protestans sur les excés du culte de la Vierge," wrote Basnage de Beauval, "que les murmures des Catholiques qui s'apperçoivent eux-mêmes qu'il est necessaire d'en rectifier la pratique." [8] From Hanover, Leibniz, who had been informed of the gist of the new treatise, wrote approvingly to Baillet's friend, the abbé Claude Nicaise:

> Mons. Baillet est asseurément un très sçavant homme. Je m'imagine que ce qu'il aura dit des honneurs dûs à la Ste Vierge sera raisonnable, et qu'il se sera souvenu qu'il y a incomparablement moins de mal à ne penser à elle que peu, qu'à luy attribuer ce que Dieu s'est reservé. Le meilleur est de se renfermer là-dessus dans les bornes de la primitive Eglise, lors que le luxe et le typhe du siècle n'y regnoient pas encor, et n'avoient point encore donné atteinte à la simplicité apostolique.[9]

And for Pierre Bayle, Baillet had treated his subject "aussi raisonnablement qu'une personne de sa profession le puisse faire." [10]

Baillet's Catholic confreres failed to see the wisdom of his remarks. To them it seemed clear that he had undermined the very foundations of the Virgin's cult, sacrilegiously attacked the most hallowed traditions of the Church, and made it an object of ridi-

[8] Histoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, December 1693, p. 165.

[9] See E. Caillemer, Lettres de divers savants à l'abbé Claude Nicaise, Lyon, association typographique, F. Plan, 1885, p. 38.

[10] Pierre Bayle, Dictionnaire historique et critique, Rotterdam, Reinier Leers, 1697, II, 657, note c.

cule in the eyes of its Protestant adversaries. It seemed further clear that he had published his work in brazen disregard of the fate of certain other writers who had published similar profanations and had been condemned and forced to retract their opinions. One such writer, Louis Ellies Du Pin, a relative of Racine and like Racine a Jansenist sympathizer, had been censured and condemned by the Archbishop of Paris for having raised doubts about certain Church dogmas and traditions in his multi-volume Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques.[11] Unfortunately for Baillet, Du Pin's condemnation was promulgated at the very time that his treatise on the Virgin was published. It is not surprising that Baillet, whose Jansenist leanings were well known and who like Du Pin had tampered with Church tradition, was accused of being part of a Jansenist conspiracy to weaken the cult of the Virgin. M. Baillet, wrote the abbé Le Gendre, secretary to the Archbishop of Paris, M. de Harlay, is "un des athlètes du parti dans son livre de la *Dévotion à la Vierge* où, sous prétexte de réformer ce qu'il y a d'excessif dans ce culte, il le sape par le fondement." [12]

Baillet had expected trouble. More than one of his earlier compositions had provoked bitter quarrels and earned him many enemies, and he had every reason to believe that the present one, dealing with so controversial a subject, would encounter considerable opposition. To preclude adverse criticism of De La Dévotion à la sainte Vierge, he had provided it with the signed approbations of four prominent Church dignitaries, including a certain doctor of the Sorbonne, M. Hideux.[13] In so doing, however, he had done himself more harm than good, for the approbations of M. Hideux were highly suspect in the eyes of the Church, because he had previously sanctioned the condemned work of Du Pin. Not long after the appearance of his composition both Baillet and Hideux were savagely denounced in three letters entitled Lettres à M. Hideux, curé des Saints Innocens,

[11] See Paul Hazard, La Crise de la conscience européenne, Paris, Boivin & C^ie^, 1 vol., 1935, p. 211. Also see the Histoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, May 1693, p. 526, and August 1693, p. 645.

[12] Mémoires de l'abbé Le Gendre, publiés d'après un manuscrit authentique par M. Roux, Paris, Charpentier, 1863, p. 224.

[13] These approbations are found preceding the text of Baillet's treatise.

sur son approbation du nouveau livre de la Dévotion à la Vierge. A fourth letter was published in 1695. These letters and a pamphlet entitled Mémoire adressé à la Sorbonne touchant le livre de la dévotion à la Sainte Vierge, accused Baillet of heresy, and urged the Sorbonne formally to condemn both the author and his work.[14] The Sorbonne, however, did nothing of the kind, but instead censured another controversial work by the Spanish nun Marie d'Agreda, La Mystique Cité de Dieu . . . Historie de la très-Sainte Vierge Marie Mere de Dieu, nôtre Reine & Maitresse, written some years before, and already condemned at Rome in 1681. Its interdiction, however, had aroused so much protest that the pope had reluctantly taken it off the Index. The Sorbonne, less generous, now branded it as the impious work of a visionary, and after a long struggle with its partisans ordered its suppression in 1696.[15] The hostility of the Sorbonne to Marie's work infuriated those French Catholics who admired it in the translation of Père Croset. To them, Baillet and not Marie was the real heretic. From 1693 to 1696 they denounced his treatise repeatedly in an effort to procure his official condemnation. "Tous les jours," wrote Jean Le Clerc, "on voit paroître à Paris quelque petite Piéce . . . qui demande pour reparer le Scandale, une condamnation solennelle de ce Livre." [16] Foremost among Baillet's critics were the Jesuits who had been hostile to him ever since he had dealt harshly with some of the most prominent members of their Society in his Jugemens des sçavans. "Les jésuites ont [son] livre sur le coeur," observed Père Pasquier Quesnel, "un jeune homme, fils d'un conseiller de Provence, ayant été faire une retraite chez eux au noviciat, celui à qui on l'avait confié ne lui parla d'autre chose que de ce livre durant sa retraite." [17] To pacify the Jesuits

[14] See Histoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, December 1693, pp. 173–176.

[15] For details of this controversy see ibid., August 1696, pp. 534–538.

[16] Jean Le Clerc, Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique, 1693, p. 236.

[17] See the letter from Quesnel to du Vaucel dated June 25, 1694, and published in Un Janséniste en exil; correspondance de Pasquier Quesnel, edited by Mme. Albert Le Roy, Paris, Perrin et C^ie^, 1900, I, 305. In a letter to the abbé Nicaise, dated July 19, 1694, Baillet lists in passing the names of two of the Jesuits who attacked his work. See the Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français no. 9361, p. 155. One must add in all justice that not every Jesuit attacked Baillet. "Le P. Dorléans, Jésuite," wrote the abbé Dubos in a letter, to Bayle dated September 23, 1696, ". . . vient de donner un traitté de la dévotion à la Vierge, où Mr. Baillet n'est point repris comme l'on s'i attendoit." See Lettres inédites de divers savants de la

the Archbishop, M. de Harlay, appointed a committee of examiners to decide whether or not Baillet's work was heretical. The Jesuits, however, had no confidence in the archbishop's committee. They knew full well that out of deference to Baillet's employer and patron, Lamoignon, it would not condemn Baillet. Fearing thus to lose their prey, they made a vain effort to prevent the magistrate's intercession. Lamoignon was publicly informed that unless he withdrew his protection from Baillet, he would incur the Virgin's wrath and be deprived of her protection in the next world. The Jesuits' action and its aftermath are perhaps best described in a letter from Bourdelot to the abbé Nicaise. The Jesuits, wrote Bourdelot on August 23, 1693,

> ont preché dans Paris contre Monsr. Baillet et son dernier livre et recemment le jour de l'assomption a St. Louis Monsr. Baillet y estant avec le secretaire de Monsr. de la Moignon le predicateur dit qu'on ne pouvoit assés s'eslever contre la temerité de certains novateurs qui faisoient tous leurs efforts pour detruire l'honneur deu a la Ste Vierge et que ce qui devoit faire gemir tous les gens de bien estoit que ces impies trouvoient des protecteurs parmy les premiers magistrats, qui devoient craindre a leur tour d'estre privés de la protection de la Ste Vierge a l'heure de leur mort puisqu'ils protegeoient si hautement ses ennemys, Mr. de la moignon s'est plaint de l'indiscretion de ce predicateur les jesuites luy en ont fait toute la satisfaction qu'il a voulu et l'on (sic) prié instament de n'en point faire de bruit, M. l'archevesque luy a offert d'interdire le predicateur mais il luy a fait entendre en mesme temps que les jesuites avoient pouvoir de tout faire et de tout dire et qu'aprés tout il valloit mieux dissimuler que de les attirer sur les bras, il luy dit sur le livre de Mr. Baillet qu'il n'avoit pas pretendu luy donner des examinateurs, pour le censurer mais qu'il avoit seulement prié Monsr. Pirot (?) et Monsr. le cure de St. Nicolas de le lire et de luy en rendre conte, quoy qu'il en soit. Il est certain que Monsr. Baillet est heureux d'avoir la protection qu'il a sans laquelle les jesuites qu'il s'est attiré sur les bras ne manqueroient pas de luy faire des affaires. Son livre ne sera point censuré.[18]

---

fin du XVII^{me} et du commencement du XVIII^{me} siècle; I, Correspondance de Pierre Bayle, publiées et annotées par Emile Gigas, Copenhague, B.E.C. Gad, 1890, p. 275.

[18] This letter is found in the Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français no. 9360, pp. 155 ff. Lamoignon was criticized on more than one occasion. "Un théatin,

Bourdelot's prediction proved only half right. Though Baillet was exonerated by the archbishop's commission,[19] he still had to reckon with the Sacred Congregation of the Index. The news that Baillet's treatise would be reviewed at Rome reached Paris toward the middle of 1694 and caused the archbishop much anxiety. It would chagrin him greatly, he informed Lamoignon, if the decision of his committee were overruled at Rome. Undisturbed, Lamoignon promised to forward to him a number of writings which presumably vindicated Baillet.[20] De Harlay's concern, however, was not unwarranted. In September 1695 Baillet's composition was put on the Index by papal decree.[21]

Unperturbed, Baillet had his work republished in 1696.[22] His enemies promptly assailed him once more — this time in a brochure entitled Sentiment des docteurs non députés par la faculté de théologie pour l'examen du livre de la Dévotion à la Sainte Vierge.[23] Two of Baillet's adversaries — Père Alexis Dubuc, superior of the Theatin monks, and Père de la Croix, a member of the same order — went so far as to petition the king to incarcerate him in the Bastille. Summoned to explain further his request, Dubuc pretended to be ill and sent someone else in his

---

nommé le P. de la Croix (reconnu visionnaire), alla trouver, il y a quelque temps, M. de Lamoignon, avocat général," wrote Père Quesnel in a letter dated June 25, 1694, "et lui déclara sans façon qu'il se sentait inspiré de Dieu pour lui parler contre le livre de M. Baillet, *De la dévotion à la sainte vierge*. Et après quinze jours u trois semaines, voyant bien qu'on ne s'en remuait pas, il est revenu à la charge pour faire à ce magistrat des reproches de sa négligence, de la part de Dieu." See Un Janséniste en exil; Correspondance de Pasquier Quesnel, I, 304.

[19] The news of Baillet's acquittal was first announced by Père Quesnel in a letter dated August 14, 1693. See ibid., p. 282.

[20] See ibid., letter of June 25, 1694, pp. 304–305.

[21] See the Appendix ad indicem librorum prohibitorum ordine alphabetico disposita usque ad annum 1696, p. 12. This appendix is published at the end of the Index librorum prohibitorum Innocentii XI Pontificis Maximi, Romae, 1681. Baillet's treatise was condemned once more by the pope in October 1701.

[22] According to one of his biographers "Mr. Baillet ne voulut jamais écrire pour . . . défendre [son ouvrage], quoique ses amis l'en pressassent; Ses intentions êtoient droites et pures, quand il avoit composé un livre, S'il ne reussissoit pas il ne vouloit pas le soûtenir." See the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, manuscript #5761, pp. 33 ff. The third and last edition of Baillet's treatise was published in 1712 with the title De La Dévotion à la sainte Vierge et du culte qui lui est dû, par M. Adrien Baillet . . . avec les Avis salutaires de la bienheureuse Vierge Marie à ses dévots indiscrets (traduits par le P. Gabriel Gerberon du latin de Windenfelts), et une Lettre pastorale de M. de Choiseul, évêque de Tournay, sur ces "avis."

[23] See Dominique de Colonia and L. Patouillet, Dictionnaire des livres jansénistes, ou qui favorisent le jansénisme, Anvers, Jean-Baptiste Verdussen, 1755, I, 417.

stead. For this insolence he was severely reprimanded and forbidden to write anything in the future. "Il a pourtant trouvé de la santé," wrote Père Quesnel, "pour prêcher contre le sieur Baillet, le nommant l'auteur du *Jugement des savants sans jugement*, etc." [24] Following this incident the criticism of Baillet's treatise became sporadic and eventually subsided, bringing to a close one of the liveliest contests in the annals of French religious history during the closing years of the seventeenth century.

Although De La Dévotion à la sainte Vierge was officially condemned, Baillet's labors did not go for nought, for his work found an admiring public among writers of the Enlightenment. ". . . [Baillet] fut dénoncé à la Sorbonne & à l'archevêque comme ennemi de la superstition," wrote the authors of the Encylopédie méthodique in 1784,

> Il l'étoit en effet, & c'étoit par amour pour la religion; à la sagacité de Bayle, à sa hardiesse, sans sa témérité, il joignit les lumières & la piété des Tillemonts & des Fleuris; il ignora les dispositions, les intrigues qui avoient présidé à ces mouvements secrets; il plaignit l'erreur & le faux zèle, & ne voulut pas voir l'envie sous ce masque." [25]

Baillet could not have asked for finer tribute.

[24] See the letter from Quesnel to du Vaucel dated August 31, 1696 in Un Janséniste en exil; Correspondance de Pasquier Quesnel, I, 410.

[25] Encyclopédie méthodique, ou par ordre de matières; par une société de gens de lettres, de savans et d'artistes, Paris, chez Panckoucke; Liège, chez Plomteux, 1784, Volume I, Part 2, p. 521.

BERKELEY'S DEMONSTRATION OF GOD

WILLIAM BOWMAN PIPER
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Berkeley's demonstration of God is not philosophically the most important part of his Principles of Human Knowledge.[1] But a close understanding of this demonstration helps one realize just how clearly Berkeley saw, or was willing to see, the logical consequences of those tenets of the Principles which have proven important in the course of philosophy. A step by step analysis of the proof also discloses how much of his philosophical and religious heritage, some of it inimical to his tenets, Berkeley carried into this revolutionary document.

For better and worse, Berkeley was a compendious writer, and his surprisingly complex argument (sections 25–33) needs considerable syllogistic hydration to be fit for critical consumption. As I understand the proof, it is composed of three steps, an analysis, and three more steps. I offer my version of it here, filling in the maxims and assumptions Berkeley has left out which seem to underlie its conclusions.

1. (a) Ideas exist totally in the mind, that is, they are perceived;
   (b) What is perceived is not active but recipient of action, passive, inert:
   (c) Therefore, ideas are passive, inert.
2. (a) [What has a beginning must have a cause;]
   (b) I perceive a continual succession of ideas, all of which are passive; some are anew excited [caused]; others are changed or totally disappear:
   (c) Therefore, there must be a cause [or causes] of all ideas other than the ideas themselves.
   (b) [There are only two possible causal substances, material
3. (a) There is an extra-ideatical cause of all ideas;
   and spiritual,] of which material is non-existent:

[1] In The Works of George Berkeley Bishop of Cloyne, II, ed. T. E. Jessop (New York, 1949). All my citations from Berkeley are to this edition, hereafter cited as Works; however, I refer to the Principles' section numbers, which are the same in all editions, rather than to page numbers.

(c) Therefore, the cause of ideas is mind or spirit, an incorporeal active substance.

Analysis of spirit: spirit, which is one undivided thing, is called *understanding* as it perceives ideas and *will* as it produces and operates about them.

4. (a) I do not excite [cause] all my ideas;
   (b) All ideas are excited [caused]:
   (c) Therefore, there must be another cause, another spirit (spirit as will).

5. (a) Extraneously excited [caused] ideas are more strong, lively and distinct than those of the imagination; they have likewise steadiness, order and coherence and are not excited [caused] at random;
   (b) [Stronger, livelier etc. ideas must be caused by a stronger etc. spirit (or spirits) which do not work at random:]
   (c) Therefore, there is a stronger etc. spirit [or spirits], that is, God[s].

6. (a) There is an admirable connection between the events of sensation, the externally caused ideas;
   (b) [All things would not be so subordinated as to make this single admirably connected stream of sensible events, that is, *rerum natura*, unless there was only one Spirit, one God, Who caused them all:]
   (c) Therefore, there is one God Whose wisdom contrives the admirable connection and Whose benevolence allows me to understand it.

or

6. (a) [One external cause is enough to explain all my externally caused ideas, that is, sensations;]
   (b) [It is vain to posit more when fewer will serve:]
   (c) Therefore, there is one God Whose wisdom orders the admirable connection I see and Whose benevolence allows me to understand it.

We need not look closely to see why this proof of God is so complex: it is because Berkeley is both proving God's existence and arguing His nature at once. God is Mind; He is wise, steady,

orderly and uniform; He is benevolent; and He is one. We see at once that Berkeley pins some of these attributes to the Deity before he has finally ascertained His existence. That Berkeley moves from a position of religious faith rather than towards a position of demonstrative certainty will strike us as we examine almost every step of the proof. Some of these steps may be strengthened, I believe, by following some of the reasonings I have suggested above. Others, particularly the second step and the analysis of mind, will show Berkeley at war with himself. Unfortunately for the proof, the conflicts occur in early and basic steps of the argument. In my analysis of the proof, I shall work backwards, taking up the minor difficulties first.

Both the steps six I have suggested are based on feelings that seem generally consistent with Berkeley's tenets and close to his practice. The first alternative is essentially the third Aquinian proof of the singularity of God[2] — from the unity of the world. Thomas says, ". . . All things that exist are seen to be ordered to each other since some serve others. But things that are diverse do not come together in the same order unless they are ordered thereto by some one being." Berkeley would not allow that some serve others, but his perception of an "admirable connexion" between all the things that are seen suggests the same line of reasoning. I am inclined to interpret "admirable connexion" in this way because Euphranor in Alciphron[3] makes an extended statement of the same position. Euphranor says:

> Is there not in natural productions and effects a visible unity of counsel and design? . . . do not the same laws of motion obtain throughout? The same in China and here, and the same two thousand years ago and at this day? . . . Is there not also a connexion and relation between animals and vegetables, between both and the elements, between the elements and heavenly bodies; so that, from their mutual respects, influences, subordinations, and uses, they may be collected to be parts of one whole, conspiring to one and the same end, and fulfilling the same design? . . . Will it not then follow that this vastly great or infinite power and wisdom must be supposed in one and the same Agent, Spirit or Mind? . . .

[2] The Basic Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, I, ed. Anton C. Pegis (New York, 1944), p. 89.

[3] In Works, III, ed. Jessop, pp. 146–147.

There is another reason for believing that this argument was in Berkeley's mind when he wrote the Principles: it will give him more reason to assert "the wisdom and benevolence" of the Author than will my alternate step six. However, this argument is not so strong in Berkeley's system as it was in Thomas', for Berkeley allows only an "admirable connexion" and explicitly denies that we can discover any "necessary connexion" (section 31) between our sensations.

The alternate step six can be found in Aristotle's Physics,[4] among other places. "It is sufficient," says Aristotle, "to assume only one movent, the first of unmoved things, which being eternal will be the principle of motion to everything else." Although Berkeley has relied elsewhere on the key maxim in this step, it is vain to use more when fewer will serve (section 53), this argument is less likely to have been in his mind when he wrote out his proof, partly because there is no sign of it and partly because it would be of little service in proving God's wisdom and benevolence. Anyway, such arguing must be rather unsatisfactory to a Christian. However, if this was his position, it too is a vulnerable one, for Berkeley does not see the continuous motion Aristotle did. He sees rather a succession of radical singulars, some of which may be — and may not be — the signs of others. To be sure that one idea was even the sign of another, Berkeley would have to be certain already of the one guiding intelligence whose existence is the very question under our scrutiny.

Thus as a demonstrative conclusion, step six, however we take it, is unconvincing. The first alternative, which seems both more likely to have been in Berkeley's mind and more nearly suitable to his purposes, leaves us with only an admirable possibility that there is one God. The second alternative, despite its great modesty, is not certain either, for Berkeley can hardly be sure, it seems to me, that one Spirit *is* sufficient to account for the stream of singular ideas he sees. However, before we vaunt over Berkeley it would be well to read the end of his proof. The "admirable connexion" of the sensible stream, Berkeley has written, "sufficiently testifies the wisdom and benevolence of its Author." (The "its," by the way, strengthens my belief that Berkeley was arguing

[4] The Basic Works of Aristotle, ed. Richard McKeon (New York, 1941), p. 374.

from the unity of the world.) This language is certainly very mild. Moreover, Berkeley claims to have shown not the existence of one God, but rather the one God's wisdom and benevolence. Such language suggests that Berkeley was merely rehearsing evidence for the nature of a Deity Whose existence and singularity were already known from some other source. It is true that he seems to make stronger claims for his work later on in the Principles (section 61), but here he seems as modest as the inconclusiveness of his argument requires.

Steps five and four, if I have properly represented them, require of Berkeley a similar modesty. Stronger, steadier, more orderly and more coherent ideas are insufficient to signify so splendid a Deity as he has in mind. Sensibles are not perfectly strong and steady, after all, nor are they always orderly and coherent; and to blame their failures on miraculous benevolence or divine freedom would beg the question of divine existence. Moreover, although we may fancy a guiding hand behind the admirably connected panorama, we can never, from sensation alone, surmise the range or endurance of its power. Indeed, since the sensibles that make up our experiences are not necessarily joined, we can hardly perceive that they are not joined at random unless we know already of a wise and friendly joiner. Berkeley can show us how to distinguish between the images of sensible experiences as well as other philosophers who base their reasonings on sensible experience, but we must come to know of causation among sensory images and of an eternal omnipotent cause otherwise than by comparing the strength and coherence of sensations favorably with the strength and coherence of the products of our imaginations.

Before I get into mind and causation, the two points on which Berkeley comes into conflict with himself, I should note in steps three and one a couple of his basic positions. He is apparently perfectly satisfied to accept from tradition that there are only two substances, material and spiritual, for he is confident once he has exploded matter that spirit (mind) is the only substance left. Of course, his prime position, that mind and ideas comprise what-is, makes it easy for him to demolish matter and frees him from any extended study of substance. And the mind-ideas bifurcation, when explained as a situation of perceiving and being

perceived, leads easily to the assertion that ideas are passive.

A study of Berkeley's basic division of what-is into mind and ideas is beyond the bounds of this paper, but I must not pass on without pointing out the great gain, at least for a Protestant, which he has made by asserting the passivity of ideas. For St. Thomas Aquinas, who commenced like Berkeley with sense experience, God was next door to infinity; that is to say, the argument from the impossibility of going to infinity was a necessary part of Thomas' Aristotelian machinery. Berkeley's God, on the other hand, is immediate to every Christian soul, for He is the immediate cause of every sensation. However, the Anglican philosopher believes that he has done more than merely modify the nature of God's relation to men by asserting the passivity of ideas as we can see when, later in the Principles, he says,

> . . . The existence of God is far more evidently perceived than the existence of men; because the effects of Nature are infinitely more numerous and considerable, than those ascribed to human agents. There is not any one mark that denotes a man, or effect produced by him, which doth not more strongly evince the being of that spirit who is the *Author of Nature*. . . . He alone it is who *upholding all things by the word of his Power*, maintains that intercourse between spirits, whereby they are able to perceive the existence of each other (section 147).

It is evident from this quotation that Berkeley feels that by making God immediately responsible for each sensation he has not only brought God nearer to mankind, but that he has added great strength to his argument for God's existence; but aside from the possible argument *ad volgarem hominem* — every honest man will admit that he is certain other men exist — it is hard to see how he has done so.

Perhaps Berkeley believes that by rendering ideas passive he has put them in dire need of a cause: such words as "agents" and "effects" suggest this. Such a belief has virtues for indeed each of us can be certain that he is not causing his own sensations, and, if the causal maxim can be invoked at all, it can be nowhere better applied than to these passive existences. But, although I rather believe it was his assurance of the passivity of ideas that confirmed Berkeley in his reliance on the causal maxim, a thing

might be passive without being acted upon. Berkeley must come to a knowledge of causation otherwise than by observing that these passive ideas need a cause if anything does. There is a passage in the Dialogues,[5] roughly correspondent to the one above from the Principles, which suggests that Berkeley believed that his assertion of the passivity of ideas put them in need of a supporting substance rather than of a producing cause. This belief is much less convincing than the other. Not only is God immune to any kind of supporting that we can understand (Dialogues, page 241), but I myself am supporting all my ideas, after all, my own sensations as well as my own imaginings, if any substance is supporting them.

I have run up on the heels of mind and causation and must pull up before going on again if I am to overtake them in good order. First, then, for Berkeley's analysis of mind. The problem is two-fold for anyone considering it in terms of the demonstration of God: how can the human mind know its substantial existence and nature? how can it proceed from self knowledge to the knowledge of God?

The difficulty Berkeley is going to have with the first aspect of this problem is beautifully indicated by Hylas who, in the Dialogues, says:

> . . . It seems, that according to your own [Philonous'] way of thinking, and in consequence of your own principles, it should follow that you are only a system of floating ideas, without any substance to support them. Words are not to be used without meaning. And as there is no more meaning in spiritual substance than in material substance, the one is to be exploded as well as the other (page 233).

This is fine, for Berkeley had exploded material substance by refusing to understand any denotative meaning or accept any analogical meaning in the term substance (Principles, section 16 ff.). Philonous' reply gives Berkeley's answer to this objection. He begins:

> How often must I repeat that I know or am conscious of my own being; and that I myself am not my ideas, but somewhat else, a thinking active principle that perceives, knows, wills, and operates

[5] Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous, in Works, II, p. 212.

> about ideas. I know that I, one and the same self, perceive both colors and sounds: that a color cannot perceive a sound, nor a sound a color: that I am therefore one individual principle distinct from color and sound; and, for the same reason, from all other sensible things and inert ideas.

This is first of all an insistence on intuitive knowledge: I just know. Earlier in the Dialogues, Philonous had claimed an intuitive self-knowledge: "I know what I mean by the terms *I* and *myself*; and I know this immediately or intuitively. . ." (page 231). This immediate knowing is very strong in Philonous, for he defends his certainty of the reality of sensibles by saying, "I might as well doubt of my own being, as of the being of those things I actually see and feel" (page 230).

But there is a second point that Philonous makes for self-knowledge, a point of reason. It depends on the same Cartesian truth, that to nothing no affections or qualities can belong, which underlies John Locke's explanation of the certainty of self-knowledge.[6] We might set up Philonous' position thus:

I perceive that

(a) Colors and sounds, which cannot inhere in one another, are met in what I call myself;

(b) Qualities and affections (like sound and color) cannot belong to nothing;

(c) Therefore, myself is a substance.

This does not actually bolster Philonous' contention. Hylas, who has accepted the explosion of material substance, should not accept the quality-substance maxim. Berkeley's only unassailable assertion thus far is that he has intuitive self-knowledge.

But Berkeley felt apparently that this degree of self-knowledge, however sure it was, was not sufficient to warrant the analysis he had fixed on to carry out his proof of God. He could not have an ideatical knowledge of the aspects of this active thinking principle; yet he needed some kind of discussable knowledge. He needed this explicable understanding of the nature of mind (soul, spirit or self) because his demonstration of God, unlike

[6] John Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, ed. A. S. Pringle-Pattison (Oxford, 1950), p. 311. I am also indebted to Mr. Pringle-Pattison's footnote 1.

Anselm's, depends on the nature of the mind, not merely on a selection from its contents. Notion is the term Berkeley has picked to explain his analyzable understanding of mind. What he means by notion is hard to know. The term generally appears tied up with reflection. Philonous speaks of obtaining a notion of God "by reflecting on my own soul" (page 231). And again he says, ". . . I have a notion of spirit, though I have not, strictly speaking, an idea of it. I do not perceive it as an idea or by means of an idea, but know it by reflection" (page 233). And in the Principles (section 27) Berkeley has lumped soul and spirit with operations of the mind as things whereof he has notions, and it is by reflection that he comes to know the operations of the mind.

There are two objections that can be made to a notional knowledge of mind derived from reflection. In the first place, reflection gives us passive ideas (sections 1 and 25), whereas mind is essentially an active principle. In the second place, how could the notion of the mind by itself be drawn from separate notional instances of loving, hating and perceiving? One instance of loving can stand for loving and one instance of hating for hating, but how can one know from the knowledge of these particular disparate acts that they all meet in a mental substance? It seems that without the right to prescind from mind all its powers and acts, a right which Berkeley forbids (section 143), we are blocked from a reflectional notion of the thing itself. However, even if one were permitted to abstract all acts and powers from his mind — not in order to get notions of them but to get rid of them — might he not, since mind is a perceiving and otherwise acting substance, dissolve it quite away?

Berkeley has another suggestion about notional knowledge, however, a very curious one. In the addition to section 27 of the Principles he has written, ". . . It must be owned at the same time, that we have some notion of soul, spirit, and the operations of the mind, such as willing, loving, hating, in as much as we know or understand the meaning of those words." And Philonous, in the Dialogues, continues his answer to Hylas' objection: "Farther, I know what I mean, when I affirm that there is a spiritual substance or support of ideas, that is, that a spirit knows and

perceives ideas" (page 234); whereas he does not understand what is meant by material substance. And again in the Principles Berkeley states, ". . . We may be said to have an idea, or rather a notion of *spirit*, that is, we understand the meaning of the word. . ." (section 140). How Anselmian this sounds, and how odd, coming from the philosopher who wanted to divest ideas of the deception of words. How can Berkeley, who refused to understand the meaning of substance (sections 16 and 17), understand the meaning of spiritual substance? Here we can commend his poisoned chalice to his own lips: what does *he* mean by "support"? is spirit a being which "supports"? And anyway, as Gaunilon has said, we all know what Atlantis and unicorn *mean*.

It does not seem to me that Berkeley has gotten beyond his original bifurcation of what-is into ideas and mind by his resort to notional knowledge. And I can not believe that Berkeley, who was so hard on the analogical interpretation of the term substance, is justified in relying on the quality-substance maxim. That is to say, Hylas' objection stands, and Berkeley is left with an intuitive certainty of mind and its nature which others may or may not share.

However, if we allow Berkeley's analysis of *his own* mind, how will this aid his proof of God? Berkeley's reliance on the individual finite mind is not like Anselm's: the Anglican Bishop plans to shift from the certainty of his own mind to the assertion of a Divine Mind not because of one or two beliefs or doubts he finds there, but because of a similarity between his mind and the Divine Mind. He knows himself as a simple active being, as a mind, which can be called understanding or will depending on its activity, and he hopes from seeing images excited, as he believes, by a Divine Will to infer a Divine Mind. One need only to consider steps four and five in my arrangement of the proof to see that this is so.

The validity of this analogical proceeding depends on the certainty of the similitude and on its closeness. First for the similitude's certainty. Here again we see, as we have seen before, that Berkeley starts from certainty of God, rather than proceeding towards certainty. For how can one see an analogy between two

things, one of which is not yet even known to exist? Moreover, Berkeley must be acting on an understanding of God's nature, for how can one find similitude without knowing the two compared things? Unless we reason so, we must accuse Berkeley of first setting up the shadow of an analogy and then insisting on the nature and existence of one of its members by referring to it. How nearly similar is his notion of himself to his notion of God anyway? In the first place, God has the power to impress sensations directly on human minds, whereas our power to make others aware of us "depends wholly on the will of the Creator" (section 147). Secondly, He receives no sensations: that would be an imperfection (Dialogues, pages 240–241). Thus His only ideas are reflectional or notional. Worse yet, He contains, in some mysterious (notional?) way, all human minds that are, have been and will be: in Him "we live, move and have our being" (section 66). Besides, He is the Creator, perfect, eternal and supreme.

In the Dialogues Berkeley pays the price of this analogy: Philonous explains how he knows God (pages 231–232). He has a notion of God, derived from and comparable to his notion of himself. Berkeley is a meticulous workman. This notion of God arises from his "reflecting on my own soul heightening its powers, and removing its imperfections." From this heightening and removing — strange actions in a man who damned Locke's theory of abstraction — he gets "an acting thinking image of the Deity." Berkeley (Philonous), who is always so fierce on the repugnancies of others, allows that this "image or likeness of God" is "extremely inadequate."

We may wonder why Berkeley paid such a price when he might have carried out an argument for the existence of a prime cause without the self-God analogy. I believe the reason is that such a proof would have lacked the integration of God's existence and God's nature which he particularly wished to achieve. One remembers how Lysicles greeted Alciphron's admission that he had conceded the certain existence of God: "You must know then that at bottom the being of God is a point in itself of small consequence, and a man may make this concession without yielding much. The great point is what sense the word *God* is to be taken in" (Alciphron, page 163). Berkeley's proof, as it stands,

makes it seem that, if we accept the notion of God at all, we must also accept the notion of God as Mind. Without the question-begging analogy, one might wonder how we could ever find out any more than Will by perceiving the stream of radically singular ideas from which the Berkeleian proof of God pretends to flow.

If the cognition of mind was a necessary part of Berkeley's effort to describe the nature of God, his reliance on perceptible causation was necessary to prove God's existence. Here Berkeley has depended on tradition entirely. Had he not done so, he must have found what I believe Locke glimpsed (in his treatment of our knowledge of power [7]) and Hume was to insist on: that knowledge of causation is beyond us. The matter is present in Berkeley's own writing with which he might have confronted his easy assumption. He realized that the radical singularity of ideas, which he maintained, was not consistent with a necessary connection such as cause-and-effect (sections 31, 64 and elsewhere): all we can observe, he has written, are "the settled laws of nature." But he did not bring this realization to bear on the beginning of his proof of God. Perhaps Berkeley would have defended his reliance on causation on the basis of what he perceived not without but within, as Locke had done. However, the difficulty he had in finding how the mind can know itself made this way virtually impossible. Moreover, Berkeley has asserted that powers and acts of the mind cannot be prescinded from the mind (section 143); whereas now he must not only prescind causation from his own mind but then force it on that stream of sensations among which no necessary connection can be perceived.

The fact is that Berkeley simply did not set his tenets to work on causation. He accepted what the vast majority of philosophers from Aristotle to Locke had accepted. Even though he, like Ockham, found no reason to see efficacy in what the Scholastic might have called Corporeal Causes (section 53), he did not question causation itself. In fact, the failure of cause-and-effect in sensible things helped Berkeley along to the assertion of spiritual causal power. We can see why a Christian who was also an Empiricist might accept the causal maxim without murmur: without it, he would have impossible trouble getting to his God.

[7] Locke, pp. 137–138.

Now that we have worked through this curious and difficult proof, we may ask two questions: how could Berkeley be satisfied with it? and what did he think it accomplished? His Christian faith is, I believe, the answer to the first question, a faith he shared with Locke and most seventeenth century philosophers. His faith, if we accept the Principles' title page, was at least partly responsible for this work, which would consider "the grounds of Scepticism, Atheism and Irreligion." And nothing but faith — his own faith and his assumption of faith in his readers — can explain his curious reference to "the choir of heaven" in section 6 of the Principles long before he was ready to consider the provable nature or existence of God. If we allow the pervasive influence of Christian faith in the Principles, we can understand not only Berkeley's satisfaction with his proof and his too easy assumption of some of the questionable principles he used to carry it out, but the chief purpose of the proof of God as well. The problems which the Principles took up (section 2 of the Introduction) were "the obscurity of things" and "the natural weakness and imperfection of our understandings." How nicely the double-barreled conclusion of Berkeley's demonstration, with God's wisdom and benevolence, explodes these two great problems!

But, we may ask, how strongly does Berkeley feel that he has exploded these problems? It is true that he suggests at one point in the Principles (section 61) that his demonstration of Providence has been "proved *a priori* with the utmost evidence and rigor of demonstration." And in the Dialogues (page 212) Philonous insists that the existence of sensible things furnishes us with a direct demonstration of "*an infinite mind or God.*" So perhaps we must take the "sufficient testimony" with which Berkeley concludes the proof itself as merely an ironical flourish. However, I like to think that the Bishop of Cloyne, satisfied that he had assured the faithful and troubled the rest, was sufficiently firm in his own faith to let his proof of God's nature and existence stand on a demonstrative probability.

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE AMISH PEOPLE: Seventeenth-Century Tradition in Modern America; A Complete Illustrated Story of the "Old Order" Sect of Southeastern Pennsylvania. *By Elmer Lewis Smith.* Photographs by Melvin J. Horst. New York, Exposition Press [1958] 258p. (An Exposition-University Book.)

AN ANALYTICAL PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. [*By*] *Willem F. Zuurdeeg.* New York, Abingdon Press [1958] 320p.

ANTHOLOGICA ANNUA; Publicaciones del Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiasticos, 5. Roma, Eglesia Nacional Espanola, 1957. 682p.

CONNAISSANCE ET AMOUR: Essai sur la Philosophie de Gabriel Marcel; *par Jean-Pierre Bagot.* Paris, Beauchesne et Ses Fils, 1958. 247p. (Bibliothèque des Archives de Philosophie. Septième section. Philosophie Contemporaine, II.)

ETHICS AND THE MORAL LIFE. *By Bernard Mayo.* London, Macmillan & Co Ltd; New York, St. Martin's Press, 1958. viii, 238p.

FREE SOCIETY & MORAL CRISIS: *by Robert Cooley Angell. Foreword by Reinhold Niebuhr.* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press [1958] viii, 252p.

LA MATERNITÉ SPIRITUELLE DE LA BIENHEUREUSE VIERGE MARIE. I. Journées d'études Université de Sherbrooke 19–20 Octobre 1956. II. Journées d'études Université d'Ottawa 28–29 Septembre 1957. Éditions de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1958. (At head of title page: Societé Canadienne d'Études Mariales.)

MEDIEVAL THOUGHT; ST. AUGUSTINE TO OCKHAM; *by Gordon Leff.* [Harmondsworth, Middlesex] Penguin Books [1958]. 316p. 19cm.

MIXED MARRIAGE AND THE JEWISH FUTURE: *by David Kirshenbaum. . . .* New York, Bloch Publishing Company, The Jewish Book Concern, 1958. ix, 144p.

DIE ONTOLOGIE DER LOGIK UND DER PSYCHOLOGIE; eine meontologische Untersuchung. *Von Otto Samuel.* Koeln, Koelner Universitaets Verlag, 1957. xii, 336p.

ROCZNIKI TEOLOGICZNO-KANONICZNE. *Redaktorzy: Ks. Antoni Stomkowski; Ks. Piotr Katwa; O. Ludwik Krupa.* Lublin, 1949; 1957. (Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1, 1949; Tom III, zeszyt 2, 1957) (Tom IV, zeszyt 3, 1957.)

THE WORLD TO COME; *by Robert W. Gleason.* New York, Sheed & Ward [1958] 172p. 21cm.